THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

In recent times fresh interest and discussion have been aroused on the problem—for it is no less—of the Eucharist. Notable books have been written, and noteworthy criticisms of them have appeared in theological magazines. To a great extent doubtless all that is largely due to the movement towards unity among the various bodies of Christians ; for divergence in Eucharistic doctrine and practice has been very marked. Some of the differences have been unnecessarily stressed to the point of exaggeration through ignorance or misunderstanding of what the other side really holds. A quite valuable contribution towards clearing the air and attempting to make manifest a common ground comes from Professor C. F. D. Moule of Cambridge in his new publication—*The Sacrifice of Christ*.[1]

It is a small book. One can read it in less than an hour. But one will want to take days to re-read and ponder it. Especially so if one belongs to a branch of the Church which by long tradition is very dubious about the propriety and the safety of speaking of the Eucharist as a sacrifice. It may help such to be assured that the author, while he knows that in some points he cannot agree with some evangelicals, is still ' proud ' to claim for himself the name of evangelical.

The booklet consists of lectures delivered to Ordinands. After an introductory chapter exhibiting typical divergences of view, he deals in the second with ' the finished work of Christ.' His main point is that of Christ's sacrifice on the Cross there can be no repetition. It was ' once for all.' All the New Testament and the Epistle to the Hebrews in particular make that plain. The author leaves us to draw the inference that Christ cannot be offered afresh every time the priest celebrates Mass. That unique work was necessary. In the Old Testament there are many expressions of God's readiness to forgive the sinner without the apparatus of animal sacrifice, the value of which prophets and psalmists sometimes question. The question arises, is forgiveness of sin credible if God be righteous ? On that point the conscience of man is never quite at ease. The comforting thought of God's gracious readiness to forgive, merely to pass over transgression and sin, is in tension with the conviction of God's righteousness. For the dilemma there was no solution until it was seen that God suffered redemptively in His own Son.

The third chapter is on ' Christ's work continued.' The uniqueness and finality of God's action in Christ is not the uniqueness of discontinuity or the finality of a dead and static thing. According to the New Testament Christ not only had the physical body which died, He has His continuing body—the Church. What He suffered in His physical body is implemented by the sufferings of the Church. This seems to be the only tenable interpretation of Saint Paul's words, I ' fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church ' (Col 1^{24}). Though the Church is the agent of Christ's work it is confusing to speak of her as ' the extension of the Incarnation ' ; God's fullness does not yet reside in her, she is not yet perfect.

The fourth chapter deals with the really knotty problem—' the sacrifice of the Eucharist.' Do we offer a sacrifice at all ? Protestants generally agree that they go to Holy Communion primarily to receive. If they think again, however, surely all will equally agree that the very word ' communion ' implies giving as well as receiving. All must agree as a minimum that at the Holy Table they offer a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and further that they ought to be offering themselves and their obedience to their Master. But this obedience in the last resort can be only Christ's obedience in them. ' *In that sense*,' asks the author, ' who could deny that in the Eucharist Christ was offering Himself ? ' ' The Eucharist is a uniting of our obedience with Christ's, and that in virtue of and as a result of our first receiving from Him the gift which He alone can offer.' Our imperfect obedience is offered in union with Christ's perfect obedience.

A misunderstanding must be avoided. The sacrifice of Christ was not propitiatory. What God incarnate in Christ did was to *expiate* sin. ' The very initiation is God's ; how then can God be said to be propitiated ? ' God is subject not object.

[1] Hodder and Stoughton ; 3s. 6d. net.

We must not drive a wedge between the Persons of the Trinity.

The redemptive activity of God should not be limited exclusively to the Cross. That results, as Gregory Dix showed, that any Eucharist must be either a repetition of Christ's redeeming act or merely a remembering of the past. That dilemma can be resolved only when we give full value to the mystical union between Christ and His Church—a union of fellowship not one of identity. 'Every Eucharist is neither a mere recalling to the mind nor yet a re-enactment but an entering into what Christ has done.' So, indeed, is every symbol of our obedience.

After all the discussion, what the author wishes to emphasize is (*a*) the once-for-all uniqueness of Christ's sacrifice, and the utterly derived and dependent character of ours; (*b*) that the keys to the meaning of the Eucharistic sacrifice are the terms 'communion,' 'together with' and 'in Christ.'

The one telling accusation made against the Christian religion in our day is that it is irrelevant to the pressing concerns of real life. The sensitiveness of the modern Christian to this charge shows that he is aware that it is not baseless; in fact, he often directs a similar accusation of unreality or escapism against fellow-Christians whose views he dislikes. It seems impossible to demonstrate, not to the outsider only, but even to most professing Christians, that there is no contradiction between genuine other-worldliness and the life abundant here and now. There must surely be something wrong with the way most Christians live, and perhaps something wrong with the way they interpret the New Testament.

With such thoughts in mind we turn to a recent book by a New Testament specialist—*Otherworldliness and the New Testament*, by Professor Amos N. WILDER [1]—which seeks to show that to its first hearers the gospel made as much sense in the context of everyday life as in its transcendent aspects, whereas the characteristic heresy of modern Christianity, whether liberal or orthodox or neo-orthodox, is the false spirituality of its message.

The faults of liberal Biblical scholarship in this connexion have often been pointed out. Chief of these was its rationalism, its tendency to interpret Christianity in terms of a few moral and religious ideas and ideals, with the result that our contemporaries find it doctrinaire and unrelated to life. Dr. WILDER, however, is equally clear that the newer Biblical theology is not immune from the same fault. It rightly safeguards the fact that the gospel is a proclamation of good news about a once-for-all event and not merely a teaching of right ideas, yet it is Biblicist in the sense that it uses the terms and concepts of the Bible without adequate translation into modern equivalents, thus taking on an archaic character. It overstresses the preached Word in isolation, thus too easily separating God's dealing with our ears from His dealing with our entire lives, and, despite its emphasis on our obedience to God in the existential moment, the claim of God and the grace of God are not related to our duties and our needs, so that the Word of God takes on a kind of abstraction. What is lacking is a personal realism, a message to the actual man, with his instincts and passions, his family relations, his economic worries and psychological ailments, as well as his spiritual need which, be it noted, is inseparable from all these. The orthodox may address him as a sinner, the neo-orthodox as a creature, the liberal perhaps as a soul, but the Bible addresses him as a man—a man and a son of man and a son of woman, as a neighbour, bread-winner, father, craftsman, and citizen. In addressing modern man we need to take with utter seriousness the truth that God's grace is mediated through actual situations. Thus if God is not listened to when He speaks in our natural relations and our secular experience He is not likely to speak to us very significantly in church.

The man Christ Jesus preached by the old orthodoxy was a supernatural figure, a god. The truth of incarnation was acknowledged, but not taken seriously. Christ was preached, but not Jesus Christ. Similarly, the man Christ Jesus preached by much liberal Christianity was a modernized teacher, giving modern man back his own ideals. Thus the significance of redemption was missed. Jesus was preached, not Jesus Christ. Finally, the man Christ Jesus preached by neo-orthodoxy is a kind of symbol standing for an unknown quantity. It is insisted that there was a historical figure and a historical event, but all the stress falls on what faith did and does with this unknown. Christ is preached, but not Jesus Christ. All these lead to unreality.

What other course remains? We must recognize that the historical Jesus was not a myth or a phantom but a flesh and blood Jew who lived a real life amid real issues. His significance, whether as Christ or by whatever other title, is to be studied in the social historical situation which is by no means undocumented for us. If we find great universals in His utterances we must not

[1] S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net.

sever them from the concrete particulars of the life-situation of His ministry, for the drama which centred in Him concerned the calling and mission of Israel, and if He searched and convulsed the hearts of His hearers, it was not because He spoke general religious truths, nor because He mediated an encounter with the Wholly Other at some timeless level, but because His proclamation of the New Age, for all its transcendent character and imagery, gathered up all the hunger and aspirations of prophet and psalmist and devout poor looking for peace and righteousness and a new temple, a house of prayer for all peoples. It is not enough to say that God acted in a historical event. We must give some concreteness to the event, else we deny incarnation and evacuate faith of half its actuality here and now.

The gospel speaks to us of peace with God and eternal life; but we are tempted to forget that their original Biblical setting is the tumult and cruelty of an insubordinate Roman province where the people of God have departed from His purpose for them. Take the Resurrection experiences and the Resurrection faith in isolation and they are sheer Divine miracle. Recall, however, that the Crucified had taken to do with the hope and promises of Israel and had set Himself to constitute a renewed and holy remnant, qualified to receive the promises and enter the New Age. Then the Resurrection and Ascension experiences mean that the disciples beheld the Crucified One in glory, both as the Son of Man seated at the right hand of God, and as the designated Lord of the messianic community, the new Israel. Thus they came to recognize that it behoved Christ to suffer and to enter into His glory. The Resurrection experiences and insight into the meaning of Jesus' career went together.

We are not without evidence that the Resurrection appearances to Peter and Paul had something to do with a clarification of their insight into the true calling of Israel and into the place which Jesus held in it. The obvious temptation to disloyalty in Peter's case is clear; but was his denial not related also to his confused state of mind as to the purpose and method of Jesus? More clearly in the case of Paul the appearance on the Damascus road was the occasion of a sudden insight into the meaning of recent events. His eyes were opened to the true import of God's ways with Israel and with the world. Here, again, the otherworldly dimension of the gospel is rooted in concrete this-worldly issues. Revelation did not act in a vacuum.

So we may conclude with the author whom we have been following—'To us also as in the cases of Peter and Paul He discloses Himself and His reign in connexion with our struggle to make sense of the world and of our lives. He reveals Himself as an answer to our needs, and not only our private personal needs but our common needs. Thus He is revealed to us not only as "My Saviour" as in a great deal of old-time religion but as "Our Saviour"; and not only as the Shepherd of the flock of the Church, but as the Lord of history; as King of kings and Lord of lords.'

In 'Theology as Evangelism' the Rev. B. M. G. Reardon makes some excellent points.[1] Theology, he holds, is not a speculative pursuit however often it has been so regarded. If it tries to be, it tends easily to lose touch with reality and to develop motives as far-fetched and improbable as the spirit in which it propounds them is unsympathetic and dogmatizing. Theology must take account of facts otherwise men decline to believe it. That theology is a 'pure' or abstract science is a grave misconception. It ought to be a most practical discipline the true aim of which is the *application* of man's knowledge of the Divine Will in redemption. The theologian is nothing if not in himself an evangelist and herald of the truth; his task is to clarify the norms or forms of response to revelation and expound the full implications. 'It is an inherently personal task: he, a person, speaks to persons of a Person, and unless we think of Christianity ever in these terms our theology can only degenerate into mere verbalism.' The theologian addresses men who before God are in like case with himself. He must declare to them the way of redemption that he himself knows, otherwise whatever his scholarly attainments he is just a dilettante.

Theology has to be worked out and systematized but it has further to be preached. The point here surely is not that a Professor of Theology must be a preacher, but that he must have constant regard to the question, Can this teaching which I am giving my students be preached? Ought it to be preached? What result is probable if it be preached? The *raison d'être* of theology is in the broadest sense evangelism. It is never merely speculative though in its systematization it can use an appropriate philosophy so long as the latter keeps its place and does not become a substitute for what it is its task to elucidate. 'In the final resort the Christian knows that the *lex credendi* is dependent upon and subject to the *lex orandi*. Theology is realized in prayer, and no theologizing is legitimate which is not the preface to prayer.'

[1] *London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, January, 1956.

Important Hypotheses Reconsidered

VIII. Typology

By the Reverend Austin Farrer, D.D., Trinity College, Oxford

There never has been, nor in a sane world ever could be, anything called 'the typological hypothesis.' That there is much explicit Old Testament typology in the New, is not a hypothesis but a plain truth; Melchizedek, for example, is made a type of Christ by the author of Hebrews, and Elijah a type of the Baptist by St. Matthew. That there is much implicit typology besides, cannot be made evident to eyes shut against it, but is scarcely so contentious a supposition as to deserve the name of hypothesis; for example, that the Synoptic narratives of the Transfiguration exhibit Christ's glorification on the mountain as antitypical to the shining of Moses' face. So what could 'the typological hypothesis' be? Not, presumably, that every sentence in the New Testament is typological. Is it, perhaps, short for 'Professor X's typological hypothesis'? No doubt interpreters will differ in the amount of typology they recognize in particular or expect in general to find; but we can scarcely formulate any expositor's level of typologicalness in the shape of a hypothesis. And would not any genuine scholar reject the suggestion that there was anything specially hypothetical about his practice in this regard? Would he not say that he did his best to let the text speak to him, and that here or there he heard a typological voice?

But if there is not a typological hypothesis, is there perhaps a typological method? Not, evidently, a typological method for dealing with all Scripture, since not all Scripture is typological. There may be a method of looking for 'typical' meaning, to see whether it is there, or not; and there may be a method of judging whether a piece of typology we think we have detected was in the sacred author's mind when he wrote, or merely in ours when we read him. But if we do talk about a method for such a search, or a criterion for such a verification, it must be understood that we are talking about the management of an art, rather than the rule of a science or recipe of a technique. The appreciation of typological meaning is no more than a special case of the appreciation of meaning in general. No method, no set of rules, will enable us either to see what any piece of writing means, or to reassure ourselves after the event that we have interpreted it correctly. After all that grammar, all that logic or learning can do, we have still to appreciate the intention behind the words. Admittedly the appreciation of meaning is not very exacting if we are reading a booklet on how to work a sewing machine, and have come as far as to master the jargon in which it is written. But if we are reading poetry, there may be no such simple step from mere dictionary-knowledge to real understanding. And the paragraphs of the New Testament are more like poetry than they are like the pamphlet thrown in with the sewing machine. Those who suppose that the problems of exegesis can be solved by writing dictionaries, theological or otherwise, are mistaken.

We said just now that it is a matter of appreciating what was in the author's mind; but that is a phrase which will bear more senses than one. There is what he had in mind to say, and there is what was present to his mind and contributed to the shaping of what he said, but was not the thing he meant to tell us. In Ro 5 St. Paul sets Christ forth in antitype to Adam; that Christ is a new and better Adam is exactly what he has in mind to say. In Ro 7 he meditates on himself as a typical redeemed sinner, by applying to himself the history of Adam, a man alive without the law once, but then the law (thou shalt not eat of it) was given him, and he incurred death (by eating). Adam incurred death (in the day thou eatest thou shalt die) but it was, to begin with, a *living* death—physical death was deferred; and such is the condition of the Apostle who cries, 'Who shall deliver me from this dead body of mine?' That St. Paul reaches his description of his predicament through thinking about Adam we cannot doubt. But it is a description of his predicament, or of ours, that results, and we are free to doubt whether he invites us to look beyond the description or actually to see ourselves in Adam. If not, then he has the Adam typology in mind,

but he has not in mind to tell us the Adam typology.

If it is difficult to decide one way or the other in this case, it does not make the case at all exceptional. It is often far easier to see that our author is working from a type, than to be sure that he means us to see that he is. But this observation does not exhaust the ambiguities which cluster round 'having in the mind.' We have supposed that in Ro 7 St. Paul knew he was seeing himself in Adam, whether or not he meant to tell us as much. But may not a writer have an idea or an image in his mind effectively enough to shape what he says, without his being aware of it at all? Of course he may. The stored treasure of past thinking steers and feeds our present thought; and it would be impossible for us to get on with our thinking now, if we were obliged to observe its subconscious springs and motives. The business of our subconscious mind is to keep out of our light. If I write down what I think at the time, I may on subsequent reflection discover the hidden origin of a phrase or a comparison; and so, for that matter, may a reader of mine who has so misused his time as to acquaint himself with my previous writings, or who shares my cultural and literary inheritance. Here, certainly, is a field where hazardous guesses may be made, but which, for all that, allows of moral certainties upon occasion. Whether or no 'I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven' is a conscious allusion to Is 22^{22}, it is a moral certainty that the one text has affected the formation of the other.

It may be held that the whole duty of an expositor is to find out and make plain what his author intended to say. If so, he has no concern with any typology beyond what he judges his author to have either stated or hinted to his readers. But it is obvious that Biblical scholars are not content to be mere expositors. They do not limit themselves to expounding what their author says in any given paragraph; they try to explain how he comes to say it at that point and, more in general, how his whole book comes to cover the ground and to take the shape that it does. Typological considerations may often be relevant to such explanations. At 3^{1} St. Mark passes from the episode of the cornfield to that of the withered hand. Why? Both are concerned with the law of Sabbath; but equally (it may appear) both are concerned with the example of King David. The episode of the cornfield quotes him as having entered the temple of God and violated the letter of the law and the privilege of the priests in that holy place, that he might satisfy his companions' hunger and his own. In the episode of the cornfield the Son of David fulfils part of the type — He satisfies his companions' hunger at the expense of what Pharisees deem the letter of the law. But in the episode of the withered hand He fulfils another part of the same type—He enters a hallowed place (the synagogue) and in that very place overrides the letter of the law and the will of the local elders, to satisfy human need. If, then, the two episodes are bridged as much by King David's example as by Sabbath-law, they both show not merely that Messiah is Lord of Sabbath, but that it is in His Davidic, or Messianic, capacity that He is so; and this is relevant to an understanding of what led St. Mark from the first episode to the second, rather than to any other story of Sabbath-healing he may have known.

If we are attempting to explain points of this sort by typological considerations, it may often make no difference whether or no the author meant to inform his readers of the typological basis upon which he was working; all that matters is that he should have worked upon it. It is, therefore, useless to object against the suggestion just made about Mk 3^{1}, 'But were St. Mark's readers really expected to take the point?' For we are not discussing what St. Mark tells his readers, we are discussing what leads him from one episode to the next. St. Mark may be aware that the undisclosed movement of his thought is liable to be divined by learned or curious readers; and so it may be a secondary intention on his part to bury mysteries below the level of the sense, for those who are either able or desirous to dig out. There would be nothing surprising in such an intention, considering the mind of those times. The Revelation of St. John is the extreme example of such writing. Like the iceberg, it carries most of its bulk beneath the surface.

In general it may seem that typological explanation is not a rival to any other type of explanation. To say that the selection and placing of anecdotes about Christ's ministry often betrays a typological motive is not to rule out motives of other kinds, moral or historical. But, like all positive explanations, it saves the continuity of the author's thought and is inimical to the operations of the breakdown gang. For there has been no breakdown of the sense, and so no one can argue thus: 'Our author could not have made such a transition as this if he were giving his material the shape of his own thought. It is necessary to suppose that he was the victim of ready-made sources, and that at this point he passed from one ready-made piece to another ready-made piece, botching the join.' That type of source-analysis which has a positive interest in incoherence will not be likely to give typological inquiry a warm welcome.

Scholars have their prejudices, but they endeavour to discount them, and no critic will set any other bounds to typological explanation than the bounds it finds for itself. But it can find its natural limits by no other means than free experiment. Let us try it everywhere and see what it will do. What the public would like, perhaps, is that the scholar should get through the business of trial and error in his private laboratory, and publish 'assured results.' It is scarcely possible; none of us is a safe judge in his own case, or can decide which of his results, if any, are 'assured'; and none of us contains a complete laboratory outfit in his own head. Critical study has always been a public drama; arguments are identified with persons and the speeches are books.

There cannot, we began by saying, be such a thing as 'the typological hypothesis.' If we must have the word, then every suggestion of a hinted or veiled typology in any text must be accounted a separate hypothesis. It is possible, indeed, for such a 'hypothesis' to extend to a certain breadth; for we may be led to conclude that a Biblical writer did not content himself with finding his way from point to point by desultory typological thinking, but worked to a systematic typological scheme over a considerable area. We might even conjecture that a whole Gospel was written in continuous antitype to some Old Testament narrative. Since the comparison of Moses and Christ, for example, is of frequent occurrence and of high intrinsic interest, why should not an Evangelist, faced with a somewhat shapeless traditional collection of anecdotes from Christ's ministry, arrange them so as to bring out the comparison with Moses step by step? Why not, indeed? But it does not appear that any of the Four has taken any such straightforward path. Our Evangelists seem, on the contrary, to keep circling back upon certain favourite types. We think we have (in antitype) crossed the Red Sea at p. 3, only to find ourselves back on the Egyptian shore at p. 5, and about to cross it again, not for the last time, either: we go through one scene after another reflecting the adventures of Elijah at Zarephath.

We begin examining typology as a reflection of the Old Testament in the New, but what impresses us more and more as we proceed is the prevalence of the type-antitype relationship within the New itself. The phenomenon of mutual mirroring turns up inside the Gospel story, so that one part is typically reflected in another. John the Baptist may be an antitype to Elijah, but he is a type of Christ. Christ's transfiguration is antitypical to His baptism, but typical of His glorification. To achieve a result of this kind, the Evangelist needs not a long single series of themes covering his whole book, but a comparatively short repeating cycle, each recurrence of which is antitypical to its predecessors. The first turn of the cycle will provide a series of antitypes to Old Testament scenes; the second turn will provide a second row of antitypes to the same types, but antitypical at the same time to the series in the first turn. So we may circle back and back through the same series of ancient topics, and steadily advance in the unveiling of the new mysteries. Indeed, if there is one observation which casts more light than any other on the difference between our conception of history and the conception of it expressed by our Evangelists, it may be that for us one train of events *leads to* another, while for them one series of scenes *prefigures* another.

What can we say, after all, about the true methods of typological study, and safeguards against mere fantasy? The Old Testament contains, in a sense, far too much; it contains almost every conceivable narrative pattern and type of saying; and if we simply quarry it for what we can find, we shall provide ourselves with enough to assign not one, but six dozen types to everything in the New; most of them frigid or trifling, no doubt, but many bold, poetic or edifying; and a great deal of such original typologizing has been done between the Apostles' time and that of our grandfathers. But our question is not, what types men can find, but what types the sacred writers did find. We ask not what the Old Testament contains, but how much of it our authors knew. The answer will be different for every author. St. Luke and St. John had the text, and searched it with candles. The Seer of the Apocalypse had the whole Bible in his head. St. Matthew was learned, but perhaps he used anthologies of texts; it would hardly seem that he had the scrolls in his study or turned to them while he wrote. St. Mark was probably much less learned, but it is hard to judge in the case of one who is so brief and so allusive.

In *According to the Scriptures* Dr. Dodd has reconstructed for us the common minimum of texts from which the primitive missionaries may be thought to have preached and reasoned. But he would not, of course, wish to limit even their acquaintance with the substance of the Old Testament to their knowledge of these few texts. Anyone brought up in the synagogue knew the stories in the Pentateuch, and a great many from the Histories, for the simple reason that it is not possible to forget them. We do not have solemnly to ask ourselves whether St. Mark really knew that Moses came down from Sinai with a shining face. How much he could quote *verbatim* is another matter. We should think twice before

we assume his knowledge of an out-of-the-way oracle from the pages of Jeremiah or Ezekiel.

To define the area of an author's Biblical knowledge is merely to outline the field from which his types will have been selected. We have still to hit on his principles of selection. We may begin from the most general ground, and recall the New Testament commonplaces: Christ the better David, Christ the greater than Moses, Christ's death and resurrection a new Exodus. There is scarcely an author who could not be credited with drawing on such types as these. Bearing these in mind, we may pick up a few evident and open antitypes in our chosen author. We may then hope to advance by the use of three principles—analogy, extension, and dead-reckoning. Analogy will teach us to look for further applications of the same type in other parts of the book; extension will teach us to see whether any type we have already identified may not permeate the context surrounding it. We quoted an example of extension above, when we began from St. Mark's open citation of hungry David entering the House of God and overriding priestly privilege by taking forbidden shewbread. The immediate application was Christ's permission of forbidden corn to hungry disciples, the *extension* lay in Christ's entering the place of prayer and so acting as to offend and override the elders. The same example will serve to illustrate *analogy*. For in Mk 11 Christ, hailed with Davidic salutations, enters the Temple of God. There follow two episodes, mysteriously equivalent: Christ coming hungry towards the Temple seeks vainly for fruit on the wayside fig; Christ both overrides and offends priestly power by His action in the Temple courts.

Alongside of extension and analogy we place dead-reckoning, the hard-headed working out of a type already unearthed. On descending from the Mount of Transfiguration, where Elijah has appeared in person, the Christ of St. Mark tells His disciples how to reconcile the Passion of the Son of Man with Elijah's promised coming to smooth His path. Elijah comes truly, but men do to him all they meant to have done in the Scripture about him—that is, in the narrative of 1 Kings, where they vainly 'hunted his life, to take it away.' And so what 'Elijah' now does is to pave the path to Calvary with his own blood. Taking this clue in our hands, we turn back to the story of the Baptist's death, to see how far it resembles what his enemies attempted against Elijah. We have then no difficulty in identifying a new Ahab in Antipas and a new Jezebel in Herodias. Antipas, like Ahab, 'goes softly' under the prophet's rebukes, but Herodias is implacable and sets her husband on. But if 'Elijah's' martyrdom is the antitype of his persecution nine centuries before, Christ's saying makes it equally the type of Messiah's coming Passion. Once more we compare the narratives, and the common pattern springs to view. Pilate, like Antipas, is half-hearted, and would save life if he conveniently could. Like Antipas he offers a feast-time boon, but it is taken up in a way he did not intend. For the priests induce the people, as Herodias induced her daughter, to make a sinister request.

So much for a few principles of typological inquiry. But such principles, nakedly taken, can be the servants of fantasy no less than of understanding. Allowed to run wild, they reduce the interpretation of Scripture to a madmen's revel. What safeguards can we prescribe? The only real check is a psychologically and historically convincing appreciation of the author's thought in its whole development; and that is an undertaking indeed. But there are a few principles of a formal kind which may be mentioned.

Typological explanation, like other sorts of explanation, carries little conviction when there is nothing to explain. To continue with the example last quoted: if the incident of Barabbas were historically perspicuous, or if St. Mark's account of the Baptist's death tallied with that of Josephus, the type-antitype relation between the sentencing of John and the sentencing of Jesus would have little to build upon. So let the first requirement be something to explain. Second we will place mutual support and consistency between the several typologies we find in our text. If St. Mark otherwise displayed a complete disinterest in the mutual relations between the figures of Elijah, the Baptist and Christ, or took elsewhere an incompatible view of the Baptist's rôle, the case for the parallel we have discussed would be much enfeebled. Third we might be tempted to place the requirement of verbal echo. But it is difficult to convince oneself that it is a *sine qua non*. Verbal echo is to be looked for, and it is a support where it is present, but it is more characteristic of some authors, and more proper to some situations, than others.

Since, as we began by saying, there never was such a thing as the typological hypothesis, we cannot pretend, in this article, to have reconsidered it. What requires reconsideration is always this or that piece of interpretation or, it may be, estimate of the theme and plan of a whole book. And let us hope that writers who pursue such a line of exegetical inquiry will never be obstinate in error, but readily admit the mistakes into which so hazardous a path must often lead them. But nothing venture, nothing win; the way of safety takes us nowhere.

The People of God

A Study of the Doctrine in the Pentateuch

By the Reverend John D. W. Watts, Th.D., Baptist Theological Seminary, Rüschlikon—Zürich

No study of Biblical theology can afford to ignore the basic unity of the Bible. One must begin from an understanding of the Old Testament's teaching in order for the New to be precisely and properly understood. In regard to the doctrine of the Church this has been increasingly recognized, so that one has at his disposal to-day a number of studies in the field.[1]

Beginning with the New Testament word for the Church and working backward into the Old Testament, one's path would be both short and relatively fruitless. Instead, one must begin with the broader concept in the Old Testament. It is generally recognized that this concept is that of *the people of God.* This doctrine formed the immediate context for the Old Testament study as well as that of the New Testament doctrine of the Church.[2]

The Old Testament Terminology

In beginning a review of the meaning of some basic terms in their Old Testament usage would not be amiss. 'People' was generally rendered in Hebrew by the word *'am*, which is to be carefully distinguished from *goi*, meaning 'nation.'[3] The latter bore a basic political meaning, generally that of a kingdom. Not so the word for 'people.' It designated the body of those capable of full participation in cultic ritual, in the execution of justice, and in war.[4] It represents an able-bodied male constituency. The Scriptures are, therefore, very careful to speak of Israel at Sinai and in the wilderness as a 'people,' not as a 'nation.' It was this desire to become a 'nation' like the other nations that was reflected in the people's plea to Samuel.[5] This simply emphasized the fact that 'people' is a term which is non-political in character.

The people of God in the Old Testament bore the name Israel.[6] The exact origin and limits of the name are difficult to determine. At various times it designated one man, the people composed of the twelve tribes, and the political unit of the ten northern tribes. It is now clear that the use of the term to designate the people of *Jahweh* composed of twelve tribes goes back to the times of the 'Judges' at least. It described the 'people,' and its usage in connexion with the nation of northern Israel must be reckoned as later and secondary. The prophets returned to its original meaning.

[1] R. Davidson, 'The Old Testament Preparation for the New Testament Doctrine of the Church,' in *The Review and Expositor*, xxxviii. [1941], 49 ff.; Herzberg, *Werdende Kirche im Alten Testament* [Munich, 1950]; O. Eissfeldt, 'Volk und "Kirche" im Alten Testament,' in *Geschichtliches und Uebergeschichtliches im Alten Testament* [Berlin, 1947]; the article by N. W. Porteous in the *Festschrift für K. Barth* [1936]; F. Maas, 'Wandlung der Gemeindeauffassung in Israel und Juda,' in *Theologia Viatorum* (Annual of the Kirchliche Hochschule) [Berlin, 1950], 16–32; R. Smith, 'The Relevance of the Old Testament for the Doctrine of the Church,' in *Scottish Journal of Theology*, v. [1952], 14–23.

[2] Cf. H. F. Hamilton, *The People of God*, 2 vols. [Oxford, 1912]; N. A. Dahl, *Das Volk Gottes* [Oslo, 1941]; A. V. Ström, *Vetekornet* [Uppsala, 1944] (in Swedish); Oepke, *Das Neue Gottesvolk* [Gütersloh, 1950]; G. A. Danell, 'The Idea of God's People in the Bible,' in *The Root and the Vine*, ed. A. Fridrichsen [Westminster, 1953], 23–36.

[3] Cf. L. Rost, 'Die Bezeichnungen für Land und Volk im Alten Testament,' in *Festschrift Otto Proksch* [Leipzig, 1934]; Strathman-Meyer, '*laos*,' in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, iv., ed. G. Kittel [Stuttgart, 1932].

[4] Cf. L. Köhler, 'Die Hebræische Rechtsgemeinde,' Rector's Address, University of Zürich, April 29, 1931, and reprinted in the author's, *Der Hebræische Mensch* [Tübingen, 1953].

[5] 1 S 8[5], 'A king . . . like all the *goiim*.' Note the clear nature of a kingdom contrasted to their own situation.

[6] Danell, *Studies in the Name of Israel in the Old Testament* [Uppsala, 1946]; Rost, *Israel bei den Propheten* [Stuttgart, 1937]; Eichrodt, *Israel in der Weissagung des Alten Testaments* [Zürich, 1951]; Hulst, 'Der Name "Israel" im Deuteronomium,' in *Oudtestamentische Studien*, ix. [Leiden, 1951]; von Rad, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, iii. 357–359.

The people of God were generally pictured in the Pentateuch as those who assembled about the ark and the tent of meeting at Sinai or in the wilderness.

Two words were used to designate this congregation of people. Both terms originally represented the ' people,' *i.e.*, the body of men. *'Edah* is found exclusively in the priestly writing [1] and those works which are dependent upon them. It refers to the people assembled about the Tent of Meeting. *Qahal* was a more commonly-used word which meant a called assembly for purposes of worship, judgment, or war. It was used in Deuteronomy to designate the people gathered about the ark in the same way that *'edah* was used by the priestly writers. *Qahal* was usually translated by the Greek *ekklesia*. The meaning of the word has undergone a historical mutation so that since the time of Jeremiah it seems to have indicated a gathering which included women and children. *'Edah* was usually translated by the Greek *synagoge*, keeping its original meaning including only the male members of the community. This may provide a hint concerning the application of these two names to the two bodies which grew up exercising the different practices regarding their constituencies indicated in the latter usage of these two words: the Christian Church and the Jewish Synagogue.

It would be well for the sake of completeness to turn aside here for a short historical treatment of the material to be found throughout the Old Testament, but the limits of this paper forbid that. However, one cannot pass by without a protest against the basic assumption which underlies most such presentations. It is that the post-exilic *religious* community of the Jews was simply a product of historical development. The development is generally viewed as follows: a family became a nation which after judgment upon its failure became a purely religious community—the synagogue or the church. That is to say, election and covenant were originally applied in the formation of a social unit, then to the founding of a political unit, and only afterwards did they become the foundation for a religious community.

A deeper understanding of and renewed confidence in the records of the period of the judges gives us quite another picture in which the concept of the ' people,' not the ' nation,' was central. It was this elect people which formed the foundation for an understanding of God's purpose for, in, and through Israel. The concept was elastic enough to comprehend both the founding and breaking up of the kingdom. It was suitable equally to the period of Moses and that of David, Josiah, or Ezra. This means that from first to last the basic issue was religious—one of faith in response to God's election.

Despite the intense interest of scholars in the subject during recent years, many mysteries continue to shroud the origins of Israel. With some confidence one can study the patriarchs as individuals led of God. One may evaluate the work of Moses in those days of earliest beginnings. But it remains true that only in that period in which Israel is settled in Canaan (commonly called the period of the judges) does one move on to really firm historical ground.

Recent studies have recognized the early life of Israel in Canaan as that of an ' amphictyony ' of twelve tribes joined by their worship at a single sanctuary and in a common ritual to be one people of God.[2] It is in the light of this understanding that the non-political character of the terms for this ' people ' take on meaning. Before Israel became a nation, it was a people—the people of Jahweh. This fact is basic and determinative for the study of the Old Testament conception of the people of God.

The fundamental bond of the amphictyony was its consciousness of being the people of one God. This was expressed in renewal of the covenant which bound them to God and to each other.[3] The covenant was founded upon belief that Jahweh had chosen Israel to be His people. Election is broader in scope and more important

[1] The writer does not intend that use of the critical symbols should be taken to indicate his support of any particular documentary hypothesis, certainly not the acceptance of the concept of history involved in that of the Wellhausian school. But it seems to him impossible to work with the Pentateuch historically without some such analysis, and the commonly known symbols are employed here for convenience. For the list of occurrences of *'edah*, cf. Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*[3] [1892], 126. For the meanings of these two terms see Rost, *Die Vorstufen von Kirche und Synagoge im Alten Testament* [Stuttgart, 1938]; K. L. Schmidt, *Theologisches Wörterbuch*, iii. 532–535 (Eng. tr., *The Church*, by J. R. Coates in the series *Bible Key Words* [1950]).

[2] Cf. M. Noth, *Das System der Zwölf Stämme Israels* [Stuttgart, 1930]; Albright, *Archæology and the Religion of Israel* [Baltimore, 1942], 102 ff., and *From the Stone Age to Christianity* [Baltimore, 1946], 214 ff.; J. Bright, *The Kingdom of God* [New York, 1953], 31 ff.; A. Causse, ' Du groupe Ethnique à la communauté religieuse,' in *Etude d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuse* [1937], xxxiii.

[3] Cf. Noth, *op. cit.*; Gehman, ' The Covenant—The Old Testament Foundation of the Church,' in *Theology To-day*, vii. [1950], 26–41. The full presentation of the thesis with its theological implications is to be found in W. Eichrodt, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, i. [1933].

to the Old Testament doctrine of the people of God than is the covenant which so often gives it expression.

Israel's basic doctrines were proclaimed and celebrated in and through the great annual festivals.[1] These were the occasions through which the covenant bonds of the amphictyony were renewed. The essentially religious and theological content of these bonds was imparted through ritual and exhortation. In these festivals, statements of Israel's faith were rehearsed, dramatized, and preached until they were absorbed by the people. The content of these ritual dramas and sermons provided Israel's confession of faith. It was this confession of faith, composed of the story of salvation and the law of God, which formed the basis of the Pentateuch.[2] The Pentateuch (or the Hexateuch if one prefers that unit) presented the origins of *the people of God.* This theme dominated the narrative of the deliverance from Egypt (with its background in the trek from Mesopotamia) and that of the conquest of Canaan, as well as that great episode at Sinai which comes between them. It will occasion no surprise, then, to find the Pentateuch vitally interested in the doctrine of election in all its aspects.

As the more important aspects of the *kerygma* or Confession of Faith[3] in the Pentateuch are traced,[4] the intimate connexion of *kerygma* and worship should not be lost from view.

Redemption from Egypt

The first of the three central articles of this *credo* was one of redemption: *Jahweh redeemed Israel from Egyptian bondage.*

Exodus 1–15 presented the story of the Exodus. It has been suggested that these chapters formed (or have grown out of) the ancient Passover ritual as it was rehearsed in early Israel.[5] This may well have been so. Certainly the close connexions with the Passover festival cannot be denied.

[1] G. von Rad, *Das Formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs* [Stuttgart, 1938].

[2] von Rad, *op. cit.*; also his introduction to the Book of Genesis in *Das Alte Testament Deutsch* [1950–53].

[3] We should keep in mind that the basic forms of this confession are those of salvation-history, and law.

[4] A complete treatment should draw in the full implications of the patriarchal history as well as the so-called 'pre-history' of Genesis. But it is obvious that the limits of space forbid that here.

[5] J. Pedersen, 'Passahfest und Passahlegende,' in *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft,* lii. [1934], 161–175.

The importance of the teaching of the Exodus for the faith of Israel was attested by the frequent references in the prophets.

What was the teaching concerning God's people here? It was none other than the insistence that the deliverance from Egypt resulted from *God's grace alone.* God took the initiative. He made them His people by His deliverance. Before He made a covenant with them, He saved them. *Salvation by election grace preceded the giving of covenant law.*

Passover with its teaching concerning the Exodus was the heart of the Old Testament's understanding of the doctrine of election and of grace. It presupposed a doctrine of God as transcendent Lord of the world. This Lord freely chose to take a small, despised people to be His, save them, to make them His own. The Old Testament doctrine of election is one all of grace, none of merit.

In this act of grace we see the operation of a principle of a 'remnant' which, it was taught, characterized God's action. In choosing Israel God rejected others. This principle was traced out in Genesis as well.[6] According to the theology of the Pentateuch, the doctrine of the remnant was an essential corollary of that of election[7] and was constantly being applied.

Little wonder that eschatological hope attaches itself so easily to the story of the Exodus. There free grace was at work to achieve the purposes and goals of election. So it was natural that the future 'mighty acts of God' should be pictured in the same way.

The importance of the teaching of salvation as exemplified in the Exodus with all its related doctrines (of election, grace, sovereignty, judgment, and remnant) for the New Testament's understanding of the Christian Church can be inferred from the reminder that the Old Testament Passover is the Christian Easter. Jesus interpreted Himself and His Cross in terms of the Passover lamb, not to mention Passover's connexion with the origin of the Lord's Supper.

The Covenant at Sinai

The Sinai pericope in the Pentateuch is found in Ex 19–34, Leviticus, and Nu 1–10. The central

[6] Especially in the cases of Seth, Noah, Shem, and Abram. It seems to have been a principle of J's theology. Certainly it is in P. Cf. Davies, *Theological Word Book,* ed. Alan Richardson [London, 1950], 188 f.

[7] G. A. Danell, 'The Idea of God's People in the Bible,' in *The Root and the Vine,* ed. A. Fridrichsen [Westminster, 1953]: 'The idea of a remnant is implied in that of election. The people of God is established out of a remnant.'

theme is obviously that of the making of the covenant.[1] Although God bought this people for Himself through their redemption from Egypt, it was in the covenant that He sealed this relationship. In the covenant the people learned what it meant to be 'the people of God.' Whereas the great act of deliverance was a one-sided transaction (God did everything; the people only had to agree to the extent of letting themselves be saved), the covenant had two sides. This does not mean that the covenant was a contract between *equals*. The Old Testament never leaves that impression. It was a contract between two parties, both of which were *competent* to enter into this agreement. But equality was never implied, nor was it necessary to the validity of the agreement.

The covenant gave full assurance of Jahweh's commitment to be the God of Israel. He had identified Himself with Israel in their deliverance from Egypt. The covenant gave this relation form and content. He agreed to lead them, to save them, to be present among them, to fight for them, to give them a land, to bless them: that is, *to be their God*.

But here He also made it quite plain that He was quite different from the gods worshipped all around them. He was a jealous God who would allow those in covenant with Him to recognize no other as their god. He was a holy God. His will was essentially ethical and redemptive. His people must belong to Him alone. They, too, must be holy. Their character must reflect His ethical will. God's commitment to 'be Israel's God' met their requirements. The covenant was established through these mutual commitments.

This covenant stood without doubt at the heart of the Old Testament's understanding of Israel's relation to God. It was also a foundation stone of the revelation of God Himself. He was presented as one whose basic character was one of holiness, ethical will, but just as fundamentally one who loves, who has mercy, who forgives, who redeems. The clear statement of the Law made it plain that these last characteristics were not to be presumed upon. God was not an indulgent old man. He was the Lord. But, as Lord, His will was to save and to be gracious. He humbled Himself to enter a covenant with a small, despised people because He loved them. Not because they had somehow forced it upon Him or won Him for themselves, but simply because He wanted them for His own.

The doctrine of election was thus given a sharper focus than was to be found in the deliverance from Egypt and the Passover. *God saved for a purpose*. This purpose was to be accomplished through His presence in salvation and through His law. It was simply that this people might become *His people* and that He might be *their God*. A further purpose lay beyond that, but it was enough for the moment to realize that this, with its deepest implications, was God's fundamental purpose.

The distinctive literary form was *law*[2] as the distinctive worship form was *covenant*. This law was balanced by the promises of God.

The covenant was not an agreement to be made or celebrated (for it was a religious act) only once. The name and existence of the Book of Deuteronomy makes this quite clear. It, too, belongs to the literature dealing with covenant and law. Repeatedly Deuteronomy reminded the people that the covenant was not binding simply upon their fathers, but that it was being renewed with them this day. This repeated 'realization' of the covenant, this renewal of the bonds between Israel and Jahweh, was an important and necessary part of their religious observance. It stood at the centre of their most important annual festival which came to be known as the Feast of the Tabernacles.[3] Modern scholarship has generally agreed that the seat of this observance was around the ark in Shechem during Israel's earliest period in Canaan.

In the period during and after the conquest of the land this observance of covenant renewal at Shechem was the unifying force which held the tribes together. Here they knew themselves to be *one people with one God* in spite of all their differences and difficulties. It is impossible to over-emphasize the importance of this gathering and its ritual to the life and faith of Israel.

The observance must have included the presentation of the representatives of the various tribes, perhaps arranged in a fixed order around the sacred place where the ark stood.[4] In the

[1] Other passages in which covenant is prominent but which cannot be dealt with here are: Gn 9^{8-17} (P), 15^{9-21} (J), 17 (P); Jos 24. The covenant with the Davidic house (2 S 7) is a subject to itself.

[2] A. Alt, *Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts* [1934] (reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*, i); M. Noth, *Die Gesetze im Pentateuch* [Stuttgart, 1940]; A. Jepson, *Untersuchungen zum Bundesbuch* [Stuttgart, 1927]; G. Oestborn, *Tora in the Old Testament* [Lund, 1945], and *Cult and Canon* [Uppsala, 1950]; R. Rendtorff, *Das Gesetz in der Priesterschrift* [Göttingen, 1953]; S. Mowinckel, *Le Décalogue* [Strasbourg, 1927].

[3] Cf. J. Morgenstern, 'Two Ancient Israelite Agricultural Festivals,' in *Jewish Quarterly of Religion*, n.s., viii. [1917], 275–293; N. H. Snaith, *The Jewish New Year Festival* [London, 1947]; H. Kraus, *Gottesdienst in Israel, Studien zur Geschichte des Laubhüttenfestes* [Munich, 1953].

[4] Can the exact order of the tribes in Nu 2 and the idealistic system of Ezk 48 reflect such ancient practice?

first part of the ceremony God presented Himself.[1] All the people became intensely conscious of His presence, His tremendous power and holiness, and of His great deeds on behalf of Israel.[2] In that moment the differences between tribe and tribe, between man and man, were obliterated by the tremendous experience of standing as one people before their God. They heard again His promises concerning Israel.[3] Then they heard God's law for Israel clearly pronounced.[4] They listened attentively, awe-struck, to the end. Then they intoned in unison, 'All the words which the Lord has spoken we will do.'[5] Sacrifices were offered, and blood was sprinkled on the people as a sign of the renewal of the covenant.[6]

Through this periodic (perhaps annual)[7] renewal of the covenant, the consciousness of being the people of God was kept alive. Both its assurances and its demands were proclaimed. When the prophets charged that the people already knew what they must do to please God, they referred to the knowledge promulgated through such services. In this time people generally could not read or write, and the synagogue schools which could be found in almost every village in Jesus' day had not yet been formed. Yet, through regular repetition of the law and the renewal of the covenant, the people's consciousness of their elect status and elect duties was nourished.

The abuses to which the doctrine of election is prone are patent in the Old Testament.[8] They constitute a warning against similar abuses in Christian practice. Yet the possibility of the dissolution of the covenant is envisaged in the law,[9] long before the prophets pronounced the necessity for its application. But through Jeremiah[10] and others there came the assurance of the new covenant which our Lord pronounced fulfilled in Himself.

The lessons which are pertinent to our study are numberless here. Central is the teaching and example of the setting and requisite of true worship: *God's presence in the midst of His gathered people.* It was a meeting of God's choosing, not theirs. This presence represented both promise and demand, both assurance and correction, both gospel and law. This meeting drew from God's people a response: humility, contrition, a sense of unity as God's people, a sense of direction, of purpose, of duty—but also a sense of assurance, hope, and faith for *this God was with them.*

The teaching concerning the covenant is also of fundamental importance for our understanding of God and His people. The centrality of this fundamental conception that God's intention and will is one of grace, of salvation, of peace and oneness with His people has already been emphasized. The Scripture also indicates throughout the destructiveness of sin to this relation. It was impossible for God to maintain this association when there was no good will (including faith and obedience) on the part of His people. God forced His salvation on no one. He maintained it only for those who wanted it and wanted Him.

Fundamental to an understanding of God's plan for His people was the fact that it was a covenant relationship with obligations and commitments on both sides, a relation freely entered into and freely maintained between competent parties. God's good will was maintained, even when tested and tried, in His willingness to forgive and begin again. His primary purpose was salvation, not judgment. But law was also necessary to the covenant, even if grace was its driving force and central motive. Because law was an integral part of the covenant, judgment was an ever-possible corollary of salvation. This covenant could be terminated, but only when men would have it no other way.

Promise and Fulfilment

It has already been noted that the theme which dominates the Pentateuch (and goes on over into Joshua) is the taking of the land. It was promised in Gn 12. The Patriarchs saw the land, even lived in it. The redemption from Egypt and the covenant unity of the tribes prepared the way for this conquest. This whole story, from Gn 12 through Joshua, pointed toward possession of the land.

This part of the salvation history emphasized some basic aspects of God's relation to His people. He was the *leader* of His people. This was an aspect of His lordship. God was active and conquering. He led His people, and He expected them to follow.

Further, the application of God's power in and through His people must be noted. This is

[1] Ex 19^{4} 20^{2}.
[2] Ex 34^{6}.
[3] Ex 19^{5-6} 34^{10}.
[4] Ex 20, 34^{12f}, Dt 5.
[5] Ex 19^{8} $24^{3.7}$, Dt 5^{27}.
[6] Ex 24^{8}.
[7] Dt 31^{10} may imply observance every seven years.
[8] Am 3^{2} 9^{7} are intended to correct popular misconceptions. Hosea's child is named 'Not my people' for the same purpose.
[9] Ex 19^{5} 32^{9-10}. Exactly here the historical sequence criticized above, in which the idea of the possibility of such dissolution comes in the prophets, for the first time breaks down.
[10] Jer 31^{31-34} 32^{40}. Also Dt $10^{12f.}$ 30^{6}.

directly illustrated in war.[1] When Jahweh was with them, they fought with a power not their own. His spirit possessed them and they could not be beaten. This application of God's power in war through Israel made possible the taking of the land.

Mention may be made of God's providential care of His people in providing such a land, in making it fertile and the people prosperous. These things hang together with the teaching concerning the taking of the land.

Like the themes treated above, this one was celebrated by a festival in early Israel—the Feast of Weeks. This came at the end of the Spring harvests of grain and was a harvest festival. Quite appropriately it was a season for thanksgiving to God for their land and its richness. Von Rad has suggested that in earliest times it was celebrated by a pilgrimage festival at Gilgal which was quite naturally associated with the taking of the land.[2]

The pertinence of the things just mentioned will be clear in the reminder that the Feast of Weeks was called Pentecost in later Judaism. The beginnings of the Church are most intimately associated with Pentecost. Teachings concerning the Holy Spirit and the experience of His power parallel very closely those concerning God's leading and power as noted above. Pentecost binds together for the Christian a chain of promise and fulfilment just as the taking of the land did for the Israelite.

These basic statements of the early faith of Israel, which also found renewed emphasis in Jewish worship, are the theological beams which support the conception of Israel as the people of God.

[1] G. von Rad, *Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel* [Zürich, 1951].

[2] Cf. Jos 4^{19-24}; von Rad, *Das Formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuchs*, 41.

Literature

THE NEW MAN

It is a refreshing, not to say an unusual thing, to find a Reformed theologian taking both Renaissance and Reformation seriously. But this is the courageous merit of Ronald Gregor Smith in his small but significant book, *The New Man* (S.C.M.; 10s. 6d. net). At the Renaissance 'history was no longer seen as the necessary but tiresome antechamber of supra-history, but as an existent power [*sic*] whose meaning could be sought in itself.' Man saw himself as free, responsible for making his own life, open to a future that was no arbitrary disposition of fate, but awaiting him as his own destiny.' Gregor Smith ventures to quote Luther to support him here: 'The sphere of faith's works is worldly society and its order'—to which he adds Dilthey's comment: 'With this sentence there enters into history one of the greatest organizing thoughts that a man has ever had.'

But however great the thought, the fact remains, as Gregor Smith realizes, that there has been for a long time a sort of deadlock in reaction to it, producing both a false otherworldliness and a false this-worldliness. What is needed is a new synthesis of what both Reformation and Renaissance bequeathed to man, and many people are aware of the need. But many proffered solutions of the difficulty are impossible. 'Archaism' (the recourse to a great group or figure of the past) will not do; nor will 'heteronomy' (fitting an alien dogmatic system on a society that looks in an entirely different direction); nor will Fundamentalism, Modernism, or Moral Rearmament, which all base themselves on partial or distorted understanding of what has been happening to modern man in these last centuries.

But in our own day we have a new hope of achieving a proper synthesis, and it is offered us in the work of Rudolf Bultmann, Martin Buber, and Dietrich Bonhoeffer. These men have seen the errors of the old eschatological scheme, and have done something towards the production of an existentialist eschatology as 'a force striking out of our future into our present.' So in an age when the Church is itself embarrassed by the old forms of eschatological statement, and where the man outside the Church can no longer accept them, we find the beginnings of a new doctrine of man, not lacking eschatological depth and grandeur, 'which will bear equally upon the rump of the Christian world and upon its needy successors, the humanists.' These authors speak of a new transcendence, 'where grace springs up as it were in the midst of human life, where responsibility is absolute, where the individual is invited to decide towards an objective possibility of grace.' Such 'absolute meeting' may be disclosed in the day-to-day decisions of the responsible person. 'It is not an extra to those events, but appears in and through them. . . . He comes not "plumb down from above," but is to be glimpsed in every event, in every needy hand upraised, every conflict of will, every utterance of hope or love. . . . This Word comes to us out of history because it comes to us now, in our present. Past history is real, and

related to us, because it is not past, but present.' This sort of thinking is continued in Bonhoeffer who says: 'Our relationship to God is not a religious relationship to a supreme being, absolute in power and goodness, which is a spurious conception of transcendence, but a new power of life for others, through participation in the being of God . . . God in human form, not in animal form . . . nor yet in abstract form . . . nor yet in the Greek-divine form of autonomous man, but man existing for others, and hence the Crucified.'

That is not easy going, though we may be helped to understand it by reading another of Gregor Smith's own remarks: 'Christians cannot be more than their master, whose relation to God was lived out in his relation to the world. He is transcendence in its only accessible form, namely, in a human life in human history, in the one world which all men share as the place of their destiny.' That I think is finely said; and if it can bear, as I think it can, real Christological weight, may help us to understand and perhaps to accept what Gregor Smith and his mentors have to say to us.

In the end, says Gregor Smith, the Christian must be both *for* the world which God made and loves, and yet *against* the world in its evil and sin and hopelessness—both, *at the same time and without reserve*. To evangelize, therefore, is not to proclaim like a herald, but rather to achieve 'that kind of identification with the world in its griefs and joys and achievements and self-questionings.' It is to help the world to come to itself. 'The new man is man in community with man in the strength of the given grace which meets him as tasks and responsibilities and opening freedoms in actual situations in their wholeness.'

This may not be theology in the orthodox key, but it is real theology; and its transposition into a different key may enable many outside the church to hear some of the true music of faith. I admire the courage and treasure the insights of the author of this book.

JOHN MARSH

THE INTERPRETER'S BIBLE

The Interpreter's Bible, published by the Abingdon Press in the United States of America, is a commentary on the whole of the Bible in twelve large volumes. It is planned and produced on a most generous, even lavish, scale, and is based on the English text of the Bible. The text of the Authorised Version is printed side by side with that of the Revised Standard Version, both together serving as the basis of the comments. The editors have enlisted a large team of most distinguished scholars and preachers as their commentators. A novel scheme of commentating is adopted, and it appears already to have won much approval. Two commentators are allocated to each book, one to deal with 'exegesis,' and the other with 'exposition.' A Biblical scholar is in charge of the former, and a preacher of the latter.

The distinction between 'exegesis' and 'exposition' is very recent, and most dictionaries make no attempt to differentiate between the two. The difference intended here seems to be that 'exegesis' is the scholar's explanation of what the text meant for the writer and his first readers, whereas 'exposition' is the explanation of its significance for the present time, and its application to the modern situation. Often it is a somewhat unreal distinction because it is not uncommon for the original meaning of a passage to be the same as its meaning for to-day.

Volume XI in this series is, like the others, a most handsome, almost luxurious, volume. The price appears formidable (£3 7s. 6d.), but it must be remembered that in these seven hundred and sixty-three large pages are comprised five separate commentaries and each of the five is really a book in itself. The seven books of the New Testament included in this volume are Philippians, Colossians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon and Hebrews. Among the contributors are some who are well known in this country as well as in the United States, such as E. F. Scott, F. W. Beare, John Knox, and their names guarantee the quality of their work. But other writers, though less well known here, make contributions of equal value. Indeed the exegetical sections are all of the highest standard, and those on the Pastoral Epistles by Professor F. D. Gealy exceptionally good.

The expository sections, offering to preachers ready-made ideas, illustrations and quotations, present a much more difficult task for the writer, and appreciation of the separate contributions will vary with the tastes of the reader. Some expositors seem inclined to use the text as a peg on which to hang edifying thoughts, rather than uncover its innermost heart. Others allow their theological alignment to shape unduly their comment on the word of Scripture. But what preacher must not sometimes plead guilty to each of these faults? Outstanding among these expositions is that on 1 and 2 Thessalonians by the Rev. J. W. Clarke, a Presbyterian minister in Missouri. His comments illuminate both the word of Scripture and the world in which we live. Under his touch even such an unpromising theme as 'The Man of Lawlessness' (2 Th 2^3) becomes apt and relevant to our present need.

Preachers will find much in this volume to give practical help in the application of the message of the Bible to the present age. He will be a

fortunate man who can see his way to place these twelve volumes on his study shelves, and volume XI is one to covet no less than the others.

C. L. MITTON

HELPS FOR THE TEACHER

Here are four quite small books whose value to the teacher is out of all proportion to their size.

In the Beginning: The Story of Creation, by Mr. Roger Pilkington (Independent Press; Limp 4s. net, cloth boards 5s. net), takes the Genesis story of Creation and reads it in the light of modern scientific knowledge. Let no one think that this is a book which tries to harmonize Genesis with modern science. It uses modern science to illustrate the great truths which the writer of Genesis knew, the truths he imperfectly grasped, and the truths of which he was necessarily ignorant. The book is fascinatingly written. It is primarily written for young people, and it is written in a style that is easy, so that the reader feels that the author is chatting with him; but it is clear in every sentence that the ease is the ease which comes of wide knowledge and real mastery of the subject. Most thinking young people go through a time when they are in difficulty about the Creation story of Genesis and the Creation story of science. We have never seen a book which will be of more value at such a time.

God and Man in Early Israel, by the Rev. J. W. D. Smith, M.A., Ed.B., D.D. (Methuen; 5s. 6d. net), presents in teaching form Old Testament history from Abraham to Solomon. It is on the level of the G.C.E. Examination in Religious Knowledge. The book is thoroughly up-to-date, and uses every resource of modern archæological, historical, and Biblical study to tell its story. Dr. Smith needs no praise from us as an expert in religious education. The teacher in day school and Sunday school will find this book of great value. But it is our hope that its use will not be limited to teachers. The layman seeking a better understanding of Old Testament history will find this book helpful and illuminating.

A Safe Stronghold, by Professor Edgar Primrose Dickie, M.C., M.A., B.D., B.A., D.D. (Religious Education Press; 5s. net), is the seventh volume of the invaluable 'Pathfinder' series. This book is a series of studies in Apologetics for young people between the ages of twelve and sixteen. '"Apologetic" is a defence addressed by the Christian to his adversary; a confirmation of the faith for the Christian himself when he is in doubt; and a resolute advocacy of the Christian way of life to the non-Christian, whether Jew or Gentile.' Apologetics is not so much Christianity *defensively* stated, as Christianity *persuasively* stated. The book has three sections. Part One is headed 'Christian Apologetics' and deals with the scope of the inquiry and the reasonableness of the faith. Part Two is headed 'The Modern Challenge' and deals with the scientific outlook, miracles, the claims of psychology, the challenge of Communism, and goodness without God. Part Three is headed 'The All-inclusive Answer' and deals with real goodness, redemption, the hereafter, the Church, and prayer. Dr. Dickie knows well that there is something beyond reason: 'Men cast out every line, and turned every stone, and tried every argument: and sometimes it proved well and when they did not, yet they believed strongly; and they were sure of a thing, when they were not sure of the argument.' So said Jeremy Taylor, and it is still true. Dr. Dickie has his usual facility in apt and striking illustration. He quotes a legendary instruction of Orde Wingate to his junior Commanders in the Chindit campaign: 'In future no jungle will be reported as impenetrable until it has been penetrated.' He points out most interestingly that the famous phrase, which Marx adopted, that 'religion is the opiate of the people,' actually originated with Charles Kingsley as the condemnation of a self-indulgent and soporific religion. This book is written with Dr. Dickie's unique combination of charm and erudition. There can be few books calculated to be more effective with the age group towards which it is aimed.

What About You?, by the Rev. George Reindorp (Hodder and Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net), is not educational in the sense in which the other three books are; but it is a book of instruction in the Christian doctrine and the Christian way of life for those who have recently come into the Church and who have set out on the Christian way. On the wrapper it is claimed that 'a chapter a day will help to keep the devil away.' The great characteristic of this book is that it is a most practical book. It is divided into five parts—A Christian's Faith, A Christian's Difficulties, A Christian's Rule, A Christian's Marriage (an excellent chapter), A Christian's Challenge. As an example of Mr. Reindorp's practical advice, we summarize his rules for *meditation*. First, Ask God to help you. Say the *Veni Creator*, or some prayer with which you are familiar. Second, Read the passage of Scripture for the day. Third, Picture the scene. Fourth, What is Christ here saying to me? Fifth, Resolve to obey His voice. Either say some verses of Scripture if you know them by heart or some simple prayer—'O Lord Jesus Christ, help me to hear Thy voice, to trust Thy love and to follow in Thy way to-day and always. Amen.' It has to be said that this book

is written entirely from the Anglican point of view, but it has also to be said that no one in any communion will read it without being challenged and strengthened in his spiritual life.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

GLASGOW ORIENTAL SOCIETY

The fifteenth volume of the *Transactions of the Glasgow University Oriental Society* (Glasgow University Oriental Society; 15s. net) is edited by Professor C. J. Mullo Weir, and contains seven articles, a short communication, an Edinburgh India Society supplement, and an index for the whole fifteen volumes of the *Transactions*. Four of the articles deal with subjects in the Arabic and Islamic field. H. G. Farmer writes on the song captions in the *Kitāb al-Aghānī al-kabīr*, J. Robson on the *isnād* in Muslim tradition (maintaining that the details of the contents of the traditions themselves might change when the *isnād* remained constant), E. F. F. Bishop considers a fresh view of *Dhu 'l-Qarnain* (examining M. A. K. Azad's argument for the identification of the two-horned person referred to in the *Qur'an* with Cyrus), and A. Guthrie writes on a Qur'anic MS in Glasgow University Library (chiefly interesting by reason of the prayers which stand at the end and which are here described). Three articles are on Old Testament and Hebrew subjects. The Editor examines the fourteen occurrences of an irregular third sing. fem. perfect verbal form in *-āth* or *-ath* in the Hebrew Bible, and concludes that they are all spurious. R. A. Barclay writes on the origin of the Tetragrammaton and links it with the Oriental *om*, familiar in the Buddhist prayer formula. W. Cosser studies the meaning of the word 'life' in Proverbs, Job, and Ecclesiastes, and concludes that it means 'full life' and that fullness of life both here and beyond the grave was included in the writers' purview. In a brief communication J. Bowman maintains that the phylacteries of Mt 23^5 were not תפילין but קמעים, Samaritan phylacteries which could legally be worn by Pharisees. The supplement contains an article by G. Morris Carstairs on the psychology of High-Caste Hindus. Altogether we have here a varied and interesting fare, and the Society is to be congratulated on maintaining its contributions to learning through its modest volumes.

H. H. ROWLEY

DEVOTIONAL BOOKS

Messrs. Mowbray deserve a word of thanks from all who are interested in early devotional literature. Not many years ago texts were almost unobtainable, except by specialists; now there is a regular flow of well-chosen literature, and Mowbrays are responsible for quite a deal of it. The most recent batch in their Fleur de Lys series consists of four twelfth- and thirteenth-century texts, three of them translated by Geoffrey Webb and Adrian Walker, the fourth by a Religious of C.S.M.V. The most theologically considerable is *On the Nature and Dignity of Love*, by William of St. Thierry (3s. 6d. net). There is a reciprocal influence between the two friends, William and St. Bernard, and one is almost inclined to say that William is the more intellectual theologian of the two. The treatise now published works out in detail all the ramifications of the Art of (Christian) Love, in contradistinction to Ovid, who had done the same for the fleshly variety. The book arrives at a truly mystical level, and is a welcome addition to the too few texts of William so far available. St. Aelred of Rievaulx's book *On Jesus at Twelve Years Old* (3s. 6d. net) is the most beautiful of the four works, achieving at times a really moving eloquence. It is notable for a very satisfying exposition of the newborn soul's recapitulation of the stages of Christ's experience. *The School of Self-Knowledge* (3s. net) is a group of readings from three authors of the school of St. Bernard. It consists of an analysis of the relation between 'Know Thyself' and 'Know God First.' The readings are well worthy of their great prototype. The fourth volume is slighter but charming. It is mainly made up of a panegyric of Hugh of St. Victor on *The Divine Love* (2s. 6d. net), and, as such, it is more purely devotional, and less either theological or mystical than the others. All the translations are first-class, surviving perfectly even the test of reading aloud. Each volume has a satisfactory introduction.

It may seem surprising to find Bunyan reviewed in such company. But the more one reads him, the more does one become convinced that he is in the true mystical tradition of 'one who has fallen in love with God.' His *Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners* comes from the S.C.M. Press in a most handsome dress, introduced by Dr. Hugh Martin (8s. 6d. net). Surely the richest facet of his genius is his unparalleled power of absolutely undecorated candour. One looks forward to the rest of the 'Treasury of Christian Books' series, of which this is the second.

CHARLES SMITH

It is not easy to give within the compass of one volume a satisfactory account of the development of Christianity from the beginning to the present day. Professor F. A. Norwood of Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois, has made a creditable attempt to do so in *The Development of Modern Christianity Since 1500* (Abingdon Press;

$3.75). The book contains more than that; an opening section summarizes what happened from Apostolic days to the dawn of the Reformation. The whole is exceedingly well written and gives sound guidance as to fuller reading in each section. The author, of course, must paint with a large brush; he declines to deal with the origin of many of the sects, confining himself to *genera* rather than *species*. Up to a point that has value; but it will not prepare the American student coming to Scotland to understand the rise of our ecclesiastical divisions.

In general, the author is accurate. A bad exception occurs in his very brief account of pre-Reformation Scotland. He tells us that the clans (and one would think that they formed the whole population) were usually at war, so that economically, politically, and in culture the Scots were not far from barbarism. That is just not true. Nor was the Franco-Scottish Alliance due to the Hundred Years' War between England and France; it was far older.

Most informative and useful are the excellent reviews of the contemporary religious situation in many lands, the missionary enterprise and its new problems, and the Ecumenical Movement.

Portrait of a Parson: William Corbett Roberts, by Miss Susan Miles (Allen and Unwin; 10s. 6d. net), is the story of the life of a most unusual servant of the Church, written by his wife. William Corbett Roberts had a varied career. He began as a curate in St. Mary's, Stratford, Bow, where he made a friend of George Lansbury. He went on to be Principal of the Dorchester Missionary Training College. Something of the man's utter directness may be seen from the fact that, 'He got at loggerheads with the Vicar's wife, and not only forbade her to come to the college, but even put the vicarage out of bounds for the men.' He moved on to the country Parish of Crick. And there, even although his parishioners were sometimes far from understanding him, they could not help loving him. But his greatest work was done in St. George's, Bloomsbury. He had two great characteristics—and they are the characteristics of a saint. 'All his life he was convinced that principles exist to be put into practice.' And, as some one has said, a man of principle has the right sometimes to be mistaken. And he was fundamentally kind. 'A stranger seeking information of some sort one day left him a message, adding apologetically: "I hardly like to trouble him." "Nothing's a trouble to our rector," was the answer.' He was a most unusual rector. 'He once invited two of his congregation to tea together because one had stolen the other's handbag.' His own, quite genuine, freedom from embarrassment ensured that the party was a success.

The book is enriched by the inclusion of several of Mr. Roberts' sermons and prayers. There is a paper on Christian marriage which is a most wise and most penetrating contribution to that subject.

The series entitled 'Ethical and Religious Classics of East and West' is addressed to 'the intelligent reader who is not necessarily an expert.' In the latest volume—*The Teachings of the Magi*, by Professor R. C. Zaehner (Allen and Unwin; 10s. 6d. net)—the main tenets of Zoroastrianism are presented; that is, 'the Zoroastrianism of the later Sassanian period as it has come down to us in the so-called Pahlavi books.' In the Introduction the development of Zoroastrianism is briefly described, and in ten chapters an account is given of the theology, ethics, sacraments, and the teaching about the judgment and life after death. Appropriate texts are translated, the translation being preceded in each chapter by an introduction which helps the reader to appreciate the texts. The book thus presents 'the essential doctrines of the Zoroastrians, with their theory and practice, their cosmology and eschatology.' The dualism of Zoroastrianism offers a solution to the problem of evil. Ohrmazd is wholly good, Ahriman is wholly evil, and the two are constantly at war. Ohrmazd has created the world and man to aid him in his warfare, and therefore man must live a good life to co-operate with his Creator. As the creation is essentially good, there is no call to asceticism; the Mean is the essence of the religion. The battle will eventually result in the overthrow of Ahriman, when all creation will be delivered from evil. Mankind will be judged, and the wicked, after being punished, will share eternal bliss with the righteous. To Zoroastrians eternal punishment is inconceivable, as it conflicts with their conception of the good God. Professor Zaehner has produced an interesting book based on sound scholarship.

The English Universities Press has published *Teach Yourself Hebrew* in the 'Teach Yourself Books' series (10s. 6d. net). The author is Professor R. K. Harrison, and he has produced a helpful little manual. The general scheme is that of Davidson's 'Hebrew Grammar,' with which most of us who have studied Hebrew are familiar, but those first pages which have been the grave of many hopes are omitted. Students who have to work on their own will find this the most useful of any grammar in general use. The proof reading has been done well (we have found only two misprints, and these of a minor nature). There are

two vocabularies, English-Hebrew and Hebrew-English. The exercises are well-graded and selected carefully. The paradigms are well set out, and there is a key at the end of the book.

In aid of the busy clergyman whose time for study is so limited the Epworth Press has begun the issue of the 'Epworth Preacher's Commentaries' at 8s. 6d. net per volume. Many preachers have been consulted and the general plan of the series drawn up. The text used is the Revised Version. To save space the text is not printed. Treatment is threefold—(*a*) a paragraph by paragraph summary of the message; (*b*) concise exegetical comments; (*c*) exposition with emphasis on verses of outstanding homiletical importance.

The first volume is in our hands. It is on *The Epistle to the Romans* and has been done by Dr. Vincent Taylor, who needs no introduction to our readers. His meticulous scholarship, his reliable judgment, ripened by frequent reading of the Epistle with his classes, are manifest on every page. Very useful is the glossary of specially important Pauline words, for example, 'flesh,' 'justify,' 'righteousness.' In the exegesis light is cast on the difficult passages. The homiletical suggestions are excellent. The preacher is instructed that Paul's message is anything but out-of-date. His great theme is relevant to every age.

The book contains only one hundred pages, but what a *multum in parvo* it is!

Some six months before he died Dr. H. G. Meecham finished his revision of Moulton's *An Introduction to the Study of New Testament Greek* and this has now been published—the fifth revision—by the Epworth Press (10s. 6d. net). Among the more important changes are many additional footnotes giving further references. Some larger grammars have been recommended for consultation and two new Appendices—on 'Periphrastic Tenses' and on 'The Uses of *ἵνα* in the New Testament' are added. In his Preface Dr. Meecham thanks all those who have lent him valuable assistance but retains the final responsibility for errors. Errors are the last thing one would expect to find in Dr. Meecham's work and if they exist in this volume we have not found them.

To show the relevance of the Christian revelation to such diverse subjects as economics, politics, history, sex, leisure, medicine, advertisement, the administration of justice and much else is a tall order. It has been attempted with moderate success in *Christian Focus*, by the Very Rev. A. R. Wallace, Dean of Exeter (Hodder and Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net). The treatment at points is inevitably superficial; but it may be of service to some readers to see how Christianity interprets life, not only in a general way, but in offering guidance for the interests and concerns of every day. Professor Latourette's name is twice mis-spelt.

Thomas Cochrane: Pioneer Missionary and Statesman, by Miss Francesca French (Hodder and Stoughton; 4s. 6d. net), is a little book to tell the story of an exceedingly big man. Thomas Cochrane was one of the first missionaries to visualize an indigenous Church in the mission fields, a Church which could independently stand on its own feet. 'The wise and far-seeing missionary must, from the hour of his appointment to a post, keep in view with unswerving purpose the objective of his own exit.' Thomas Cochrane was also the founder of medical services in China, and even if he had not been a missionary, he would have ranked with the great medical figures of the world. Thomas Cochrane was one of the very few fully ecumenically minded men of his day. He frequently by the force of his personality and sincerity succeeded in bringing co-operation between the churches where co-operation looked impossible. This little book simply and vividly tells the story of a man who left his mark on modern missions in a unique way.

Messrs. Marshall, Morgan and Scott have issued a new edition of *A Wayfarer's Psalter*, by the Rev. John Macbeath, M.A., D.D. (10s. net). This book was first published in 1944. Dr. Macbeath has not attempted a detailed exposition of the psalms nor made a critical study. He aids faith and stimulates devotion by plucking out of the heart of every psalm a significant and useful lesson.

A new Bible in the Authorised Version—*The Oxford Junior Study Bible*—has been issued by the Oxford University Press. There are two types of this Bible. The larger is about $8'' \times 5''$ (11s. 6d. net) and the smaller $5\frac{1}{2}'' \times 3\frac{1}{2}''$ (8s. 6d. net). Choice is also provided in bindings—blue, red or black. The sixty pages of modern helps to study are particularly well done. An account of the Books of the Bible, the translations and the languages of the Bible are given. Good maps and illustrations (photogravures in the larger edition) add to the value. We recommend without hesitation this Junior Study Bible for the use of members of Bible Classes and Study Groups and also for senior Sunday School scholars.

Religious Education

Teaching Religion to the Secondary Age Group[1]

By Joan Hazelden Walker, B.D., Ph.D., Whitelands College, London

No educationist minimizes the problems which surround the teacher in the secondary school; and those who are responsible for the religious training, whether in parish or school, are acutely aware of their own inadequacy. With regard to Sunday school teachers, I believe that, unless they know what we are trying to achieve in our secondary schools, they will find it very difficult to get any response from the children of this age-range in the parish.

Once one has accepted the responsibility of teaching religion in any way whatsoever, one is immediately faced with a tremendous challenge. I want to consider not the children we teach, for I have no pretensions to any specialist knowledge in this field, but ourselves as teachers of Scripture.

1. *Aim.* Every student in training is taught to discover the precise nature of the aim of his or her lessons. Many plan out what they believe is a good scheme and one which will please both children and supervisor, or perhaps in the reverse order. Then they settle down to scratch their brains for an appropriate aim. I once had a student whose special study at college was pottery—in fact, when she came down to the task of arranging her teaching practice, she found it difficult to think of anything except in terms of pots. She brought her Divinity scheme to me. Her aim was neatly printed at the top: To teach the Old Testament through Pottery. But she was no archæologist. The scheme unfolded—pots Abraham used, the pot that Rebecca carried to the well, pots, pots and more pots. She was a little shaken when I asked her to think over the purpose of teaching Scripture to a class of ten-year olds and her responsibility in that purpose. What then is our aim? I do not think that we need ever trouble to find specific aims for every lesson, but what we need to do is to discover our aim for all time and to measure all our dealings with the young by it. If one has not thought out any specific aim, perhaps one might consider that which expresses in some form or other the words so familiar to us all: Thy kingdom come on earth. This aim straightway prevents us from planning those lessons or lectures which we know to be popular but have precisely no value in the ultimate purpose of life.

2. *Ourselves as Instruments.* Having found our aim, we turn to ourselves as the exponents of that aim. Our class knows us by our appearance, by what we say and by our actions. Teachers are living visual aids. How often this is said! But it should not be forgotten that still too frequently the adolescent girl associates religion with drab, dull piety, and the boy shies away from the anæmic, affected-voiced and pious-looking master. One becomes very conscious of the teacher as the best visual aid when watching successive generations of students taking Scripture lessons. How we look, speak and act changes the whole atmosphere of the class-room. The young have an uncanny awareness of us; they know if we cannot discipline them; they know too whether we are sincere, whether our actions correspond with our words; and they reflect our moods. Hence it is essential to consider ourselves as instruments of our aim.

3. *Content of Teaching.* The aim thought out, the personal responsibility appreciated, then the all-important question of the content of our teaching imposes itself. One need never fear that there is not enough to teach, nor that there is an inadequate supply of printed material to guide us in our selection, whether we plan for Bible class, youth club, day or Sunday school. The trouble is the very opposite. In the day school, Religious Knowledge Syllabuses appear to cover almost every aspect. Sunday school teachers have more lesson notes than is good for them. The difficulties are not inherent in the material but in ourselves as conveyors of this material. Either we are convinced and practising Christians, or we satisfy ourselves with the belief that religion has an excellent character-building function for the young but one which we have outgrown. Or perhaps we water down the faith we teach, because it is easier to get it across? Many do; often, no doubt, unintentionally, because they have never faced up to the fundamentals of the Church. How often is the hymn, 'There is a green hill . . .', heard without the verse which sings of the doctrine of the Atonement? One does not fool the young. They

[1] Extracts from a paper read at the S.P.C.K. Annual Book Fair, 30th October 1954.

sense inability to present the fundamental truths of Christianity and wonder why one bothers to present anything at all. Wherever one may be called to teach, true Christianity cannot be presented without its creeds, the Bible cannot be isolated from the Church, nor creed from worship.

4. *Method of Teaching.* Religion is not bound to antiquated forms, nor need its teaching in popular form mean a watering down of essentials. In a positive way, this means that all modern methods[1] can be used in teaching religion. This principle should apply to both Sunday school and day school.

Modern experiments are not to be feared in the Sunday school. Here the teacher needs to understand the day-school background of the children in the parish. Here is a recent example. A Sunday school teacher was unable to take her class of infants and I was asked to fill the breach. The atmosphere was still that of fifty years ago. Nursery chairs were the only concession to progress, but they were set out in exact rows, right up to the back of the class-room. The children looked all wrong and I sensed the well-known tension which leads to restlessness and tears. We all rearranged the room and I planned my lesson according to the accepted pattern of the day school. The faces of the children were transformed; for we understood each other in the familiar. Of course, one appreciates that the situation is different when handling those of secondary age range, but one still must understand the methods of the day school.

The secondary modern school is trying to express the teaching of all subjects in terms of the everyday life of the young. Music and movement cease to be solely an exercise in scales and bodily fitness. Yet they are the expression of the harmony of body and soul, a harmony which the young readily appreciate, if given the chance. History is brought to their immediate neighbourhood and becomes the living presence of people acting in the past, not a series of empty and forgotten dates. One could continue throughout the entire curriculum which has become so varied and broad. What then of the teaching of religion? The essence of religion is the harmony of body and soul. All acting and thinking of Christian society should express this and, therefore, all education should be religious; and all religious teaching should learn from other branches of education. Methods are, therefore, of vital importance, if we wish to make any lasting impression upon the children.

[1] An excellent handbook is that by a Hertfordshire headmaster, B. Youngman, *Teaching Religious Knowledge* [London, 1953].

So many teachers skip the *Introduction to the Bible* because it means a considerable amount of personal work. But without it, one might as well imagine building a house before laying the foundations. A very useful beginning is the film strip produced by the B.F.B.S., called *The Story of the Bible.* So are the series of post cards on Bible manuscripts, published by the British Museum at 3d. a card. Many an agreed syllabus has an excellent section on this subject. One is amazed at the interest created among the young. Once this is created, the battle is half won. Then one can proceed with the task of teaching the content. It may seem ambitious to embark upon a course of New Testament Introduction in the secondary modern school, but it can be done. Dr. Hunter's book, *Introducing the New Testament,* needs little adaptation for lessons, if it is implemented with the suggestions just outlined.

The teaching of content is made much more alive by film strips, but there are pitfalls which need to be marked. The film strips on background are the best, especially those produced for schools, as, for example, by *Picture Post,* with excellent notes by the Principal of Westminster College, Mr. Trevor Hughes. Those strips which retell the Bible stories in modern film technique are to be avoided. They are as unreal as the placards advertising 'in glorious technicolour' some ancient story. Apart from the *Picture Post* series, the *Two Thousand Years Ago* strips, produced by Common Ground, provide a skilful reconstruction of life in Palestine in the first century of our Lord. These have been made from a full-length sound film, which should be shown at least once in every year. Strips on the lives of famous Christians have been wisely prepared and are an invaluable means of implementing the syllabus. One should resist the temptation of showing the whole strip in one lesson. Although a pleasant relaxation for class and teacher, it tends to relieve both of their responsibilities to work.

Many find dramatic work of great use in teaching, whether the production of religious plays on a large scale or merely spontaneous performances in the class-room. The latter often can teach more than a whole series of lessons and can lead to the creation of real interest. I once had a class of backward twelve-year-old boys, whose knowledge of the Bible appeared non-existent. I tried to gain their interest by using the last play of the cycle, *Man Born to be King.* When reading the Crucifixion scenes, one 'tough' was visibly moved and had brushed away a tear. Having finished, the whole class asked if they could now read the story in the Bible itself,

because, as one remarked, 'we never knew it was real before.' But dramatic activities in the class-room can be destructive as well; they can be occasions for showing-off, self-consciousness and misplaced hilarity. Even if successful, common-sense dictates that one cannot convert the world by religious drama nor, indeed, by any single method. But the expert in one field alone scarcely admits it.

Creative activity may be, similarly, invaluable or purposeless. Both corporate and individual activities must be planned. It is a complete waste of time to have the whole class illustrating some incident of a lesson on scraps of paper, invariably lost as soon as possible. Yet it is still done; and too often in Scripture. There are many lasting constructive activities which can be introduced in the class-room. Again reference is made to Mr. Youngman's book. Here many examples of the use of various techniques borrowed from the teaching of other subjects are outlined. The class-room may be filled with large pictorial maps, models and charts. The children may even edit an 'early Christian newspaper' with all its possibilities, provided that the news is true.

Furthermore, they have to learn and appreciate the Church in action in the modern world, whether in its many welfare and social activities or in the work of craftsmen in the service of the Church. On the other hand, the contribution the young will make, if it is expected of them, is often neglected. How readily they will drift into taking things for granted, if they are never given individual responsibility nor their interest awakened. In the parish, too, there are many opportunities lost, because adults are selfish, denying the young the tasks they enjoy doing themselves.

In conclusion, if our aim is to forward the Kingdom of God on earth, we are concerned with the huge problem of leading the young into the worshipping life of the Church and that of teaching them all their responsibilities as citizens of that Kingdom. Whatever the influence of any particular lesson, whatever our methods, teaching should be measured by this alone.

Contributions and Comments

John the Baptist in the Fourth Gospel

In the first chapter of St. John, immediately following the Prologue, four days are described in *vv.* 19–51. The first begins at *v.* 19, the second at *v.* 29 ('On the morrow'), the third at *v.* 35 ('Again on the morrow'), and the fourth at *v.* 43 ('On the morrow'). When we examine these four days closely, a remarkable fact emerges:

On the first day John the Baptist occupies the stage, as it were, and he is talking about himself in response to the question, 'Who art thou?' Jesus does not appear; at the close His approach is hinted but He remains unnamed and unknown—'one whom ye know not.'

On the second day John can see Jesus approaching; Jesus is off-stage but is coming nearer. And this time John is talking not about himself but about Jesus: 'Behold, the Lamb of God.' We can't see Jesus yet but John can.

On the third day John and Jesus are on the stage side by side; we can see them both now and we notice that John's disciples begin to forsake him and to follow Jesus.

On the fourth day John is nowhere to be seen; Jesus occupies the stage and John is not even mentioned.

These four days provide a perfect illustration of the words ascribed to John in 3^{30}: 'He must increase, but I must decrease.' Preachers sometimes use these words to show that, in the Christian life, the self-life must die that the Christ-life may expand. 'As the marble wastes, the image grows.' Theodore Monod's hymn, 'O the bitter shame and sorrow,' well illustrates the process; and it is a coincidence that its four verses fit the four days we have been considering. They close with the lines: (*v.* 1) 'All of self, and none of Thee'; (*v.* 2) 'Some of self, and some of Thee'; (*v.* 3) 'Less of self, and more of Thee'; (*v.* 4) 'None of self, and all of Thee.' The evangelist has given a most skilful opening to his narrative with this gradual approach of Jesus to the central place. The sequence noted is surely not accidental but rather due to superb artistry.

When we look at the references to John the Baptist in the Gospel as a whole, we find a further illustration of the principle, 'He must increase, but I must decrease.' Apart from the Prologue, there are the following references to the Baptist: 1^{19-42} 3^{23}–4^{1} (whether we transfer 3^{31-36} elsewhere or not, does not affect the present matter) 5^{33-36} 10^{40-41}. Notice that *the passages become shorter* each time and dwindle to nothing. The final

words are: 'John indeed did no sign; but all things whatsoever John spake of this man were true.' Can this second example of progressive diminution be just an accident?

T. Francis Glasson

Horley, Surrey

Did Jesus Speak Greek?

On at least one reader, the effect of Mr. Argyle's delightful note in the December issue (lxvii. 92) was quite different from the author's expectation. It was gratitude, not that we may have in the Gospels some of the very words of Jesus, but for the assurance that Jesus, our Master, shared some of the stumbling-blocks of language which hinder so many of His followers to-day.

Perhaps in Britain it is not easy to remember that millions of Christians live in a society where they must habitually use at least two languages. Here in tropical Africa there are very few people, except the most primitive, who do not in ordinary everyday life use two, three, or even four *acquired* languages.

I think it was Professor Firth, of London University, who said that the least important function of language is to communicate the ideas of the speaker to the hearer. What spoken language does is to create ideas in the mind of the speaker and to establish implicit relationships between speaker and hearer which may not—probably will not—have anything whatever to do with the explicit subject of conversation.

If you use two languages, will your mind be able to deal with a double set of thought-images? If you have learnt to speak of God and Calvary and Bethlehem in a language not your own (which in this Diocese, the size of Ireland, will be true of fourteen out of our nineteen languages) will the words have behind them anything but emptiness? How frequently will you know for sure what relationship is being created by your words between you, the speaker, and him, the hearer?

In my years in Africa I have never yet been spoken to by an African about the weather—unless there had been a drought or a landslide or a flood—but because I am an Englishman, I still catch myself remarking casually in an African language, 'Nice day yesterday, wasn't it?' expecting thereby to build up communion with the man I am talking to as I would with another Englishman. When nothing happens, I am still surprised. Last Sunday I overheard a Munyoro (of Bantu race) greeting an Acoli (Nilotic race) in the Acoli language. The Munyoro introduced into his greeting the long series of 'hums' which are the Bantu equivalent of talk about the weather, but his Acoli friend looked at him as though he were to be pitied for an impediment in his speech! No trust, no communication, no *communion* were established.

It is a comfort to know that Jesus, too, lived in a society where language was a problem; to know that He Himself wrestled with the misunderstandings of Greek over against Aramaic—with perhaps the Hebrew of the Temple complicating men's thoughts about God. It cheers us to know that He started talking in Greek about the weather, and then realized that that should only be done in Aramaic, and had to begin all over again with the soul He was trying to meet; that even when He spoke of the Kingdom He could not be quite sure whether (if I may put it so) there would be a Melek-complex or a Basileus-complex evoked in the minds of His hearers. We are grateful to Mr. Argyle for this new light.

J. K. Russell

Gulu, Uganda

τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων: 1 Corinthians x. 11

A Suggestion

In his *St. Paul and the Mystery Religions* H. A. A. Kennedy, referring to τέλειοι in 1 Co 2^6, gives instances of τέλος used with the connotation 'mystic rite.' He also gives instances of the employment of terms in First Corinthians which seem to him to have had definite associations with the Mysteries—1 Co 15^{51} (I will tell you a μυστήριον); 1 Co 13^2 (μυστήρια and γνῶσις); 1 Co 4^1 (stewards of the μυστήρια of God); 1 Co 2^7 (a divine wisdom ἐν μυστηρίῳ).

Examples of τέλος used with the meaning 'sacred rite' (Liddell and Scott) are not very frequent but a clear instance is found in Plato's *Republic*, 560 E: '. . . τελουμένου ψυχὴν μεγάλοισι τέλεσι,' '. . . the soul of a man initiated with grand rites.' Other related Greek words are used commonly of initiation—τελετή, τελέω, τελειόω.

Could not this secondary meaning of τέλος be intended in 1 Co 10^{11}? Here the reference to τὰ

τέλη comes straight after a discussion of spiritual food—food sacrificed and the divine food and drink enjoyed by the Israelites in the desert, whose punishment for faithlessness is recorded as an example to us—εἰς οὓς τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων κατήντηκεν. Could this not mean: 'To whom the eternal Mysteries have come down'; or, taking a richer but perfectly allowable meaning out of κατήντηκεν, 'Who are the heirs of the Mysteries of the ages'? Is it not significant that a few sentences after the use of this phrase St. Paul embarks on his great discussion of the Lord's Supper?

It might be suggested that since τέλος normally means 'end' in the New Testament, a special meaning should be ruled out in a doubtful case. But, then, would not the new meaning, which seems to fit the context well enough, make the verb κατήντηκεν slightly more understandable? However much weight we may give to such considerations, I feel what we have to decide is whether St. Paul was here thinking eschatologically, or, as I suspect, sacramentally in language adapted to the religious background of the Corinthian Christians.

M. M. Bogle

Edinburgh

An Alleged Semitism

In The Expository Times, lxvi. [March, 1955], 177, I drew attention to a paragraph of *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*[2], 83, in which Principal Black claims as a probable Semitism the construction whereby a preposition is repeated before each noun of a series which it governs. He writes: 'The construction is intolerable in literary Greek.' I endeavoured to show that this last statement is incorrect by quoting some instances of its occurrence in literary Greek. In The Expository Times, lxvi. [May, 1955], 252–254, Dr. Nigel Turner wrote a careful and interesting reply in which he agreed that the usage is not intolerable in literary Greek, but argued that it is nevertheless 'unusual' or 'oratorical.'

He admitted that the repetition of the preposition is a marked feature of Plato's style. This may suggest that it is a feature of dialogue, or colloquial Greek. The Greek of the New Testament is also to a considerable extent colloquial Greek. A suitable parallel would be the Greek of the papyri. In *Select Papyri*, edited by A. S. Hunt and C. G. Edgar (Loeb series), Vol. i., there appear to be twenty-seven instances of the repetition of the preposition. (I have not included those instances where the terms governed by the preposition are so widely separated that a repetition of the preposition is necessary for the sake of clarity.) On the other hand, there appear to be twenty-six instances where the preposition could have been repeated, but is not. This is almost exactly the proportion which Dr. Turner finds in John, which he describes as 'the most "Semitic" Gospel in this respect.' I submit that the alleged Semitism may not be a Semitism at all, any more than the instances in the papyri are Semitic.

Dr. Turner shows that the usage in question is found 'with remarkable consistency' in the New Testament as a whole. But surely one would not expect this to be so if it arose from a Semitic origin. One would expect it to be more frequent in the Gospels, where translation from Aramaic is sometimes possible, than in the Epistles, where it is most improbable. Yet Dr. Turner has shown it to be more frequent in two of Paul's Epistles (Romans and 1 Corinthians) than in any of the Gospels. On his own showing the explanation of the phenomenon is more likely to reside in the nature of Greek than in that of Aramaic, despite the fact that the construction in question is undoubtedly a feature of Hebrew and Aramaic.

A. W. Argyle

Oxford

The Psalter in the Parish Worship of the Church of England

In The Expository Times for November, 1955 (lxvii. 41) the Rev. Norman Adcock writes: 'The Anglican priest is bound by solemn vow at his ordination to recite Matins and Evensong daily in Church. . . .'

This, of course, is not true, as a glance at the Ordinal in the Book of Common Prayer will show. There is no such 'vow' at ordination, or at any other time.

W. G. E. Squire

Isles of Scilly, Cornwall

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

Rules and Freedom

By the Reverend T. A. Rockley, B.A., Canterbury

G. K. Chesterton described an imaginary sea voyage in the course of which an island was sighted. There were no sandy beaches, but cliffs rising sheer from the water to a considerable height. As the ship passed by the passengers could see the normal life of the island going on, men and women happily at work, boys and girls at play. On the return journey there was a strange silence on the island, and no movement. Going closer to investigate, it was found that there was neither work nor play, but all the inhabitants were huddled together in the middle of the island. The reason for this? There had been a meeting of all the island people, who had objected to the railings around the edge of the cliffs. We are like animals in a cage, they had said, we are shut in, we have no freedom. Accordingly the railings were removed, but that had given them no freedom. Rather they had lost their freedom. They now feared to move, lest they should fall over the cliff edge into the sea.

Freedom is not the absence of restriction and rules. Consider the rules of the road, such as you will find in the Highway Code. Imagine a busy town, in which all the drivers of cars, buses, lorries, and all the riders of bicycles, demanded freedom, freedom to go just how and when and where they wished, ignoring the police on traffic duty and disregarding the traffic lights, pleasing themselves on which side of the road they would drive, giving any signals they thought fit whichever way they wanted to turn, going the wrong way along one-way streets, parking anywhere they wished, and so on. They might exercise one kind of freedom, but they would quickly find they had lost all freedom because all traffic would soon come to a full stop in the most awful mess. The way to real freedom for everybody is to obey rules.

There are rules of reading, writing, and arithmetic. There are rules of chess and football. There are rules of electric wiring, of radio and television sets, of baking and sewing and gardening. The rules do not spoil all these things. They make them what they are.

Have you ever thought of God's commandments in this way? God has not given us these rules to spoil life, but to make it the real thing, what Jesus called abundant life, life lived in all its richness and fullness. God's commandments do not hinder freedom, they make us free. God's service is perfect freedom. The sensible thing is for all of us not only to learn the commandments but to practise them.

The Clever Crows

By Rita F. Snowden, Auckland, New Zealand

Everybody knew Old Jonathan, and everybody loved him, the boys and girls especially. His real name was Mr. Jonathan Morton, but the boys and girls called him Uncle Jonathan. His heart was full of kindness and his face full of smiles, and at the ends of his eyes, spanning out toward his ears, were little lines that showed where the smiles had been, called 'crow's feet.'

And for that matter his best story was about crows—real crows that came to eat up his father's corn. That, of course, was a long time ago, but it was just as real to Uncle Jonathan as if it had happened yesterday, and the boys and girls never tired of hearing of it.

'Tell us about scaring the crows,' they would ask. And old Jonathan would put out his favourite pipe, and lay it away safely in his pocket, and begin. He never varied it, because it was so clear in his mind. It had been his first job—to scare the crows from his father's crops. He wasn't very big, and at first he could only do it on Saturdays when he hadn't to go to the village school. At first he had a strange kind of rattle, and when he was big enough he had a little gun.

'And what did you do when you had to go to school?' the children always asked. And then he told them about the trick he played on the crows. On school days he hoped the crows wouldn't miss him, though there was no sound of a rattle or a gun. But the field was not bare, for all that, and many birds still came. Early on the first school day of the week Jonathan took an old broomstick that had been the handle of the broom with which his mother had brushed out her house, and across it near the top he tied another stick, not quite so long. And on the top of it he placed his old shabby Saturday hat, and on the rest of it he put his old shabby Saturday clothes. Then, when he hoped no birds were looking, he took it out early and stood it up in the field.

It was a good scarecrow—a very good scarecrow indeed—exactly the kind that the poet had

in mind when he wrote his little poem describing it with

'One shoulder up, the other down,
His hat upon a broomstick crown;
I saw,' said he, 'a ragged scarecrow stand,
Guarding the sown and sunlit land.

Awhile I stood, and not a crow
Near the rich furrows dared to go;
But when I turned away, why then
They fell to work like husbandmen.'

And that was exactly what Jonathan's father found. Those old crows were not such duffers after all—indeed, they were very wily and clever. Though the same old Saturday hat and the same old Saturday clothes were in the field, they could tell as easily as easily which was Jonathan and which was the scarecrow. The scarecrow was just a pretence.

Jesus talked about people whose religion was just like that—and they hoped that nobody would notice it. But Jesus did. He said: 'Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widow's houses, and *for a pretence* make long prayer' (Mt 23^{14}). And He told about two men who went into the Temple to pray—one man stood proudly where everybody could see him, and hear him, for he used long words in his prayer—out loud. And the other man was so real and sure in his love of God that he did hardly more than bow his head silently to pray.

But Jesus said, Anybody could tell the difference—one was just scarecrow religion, and the other was real.

Our religion, as Paul wrote down in Ph 1^{18} is either 'in pretence, or in truth.' Even a crow can tell the difference.

The Christian Year

TRINITY SUNDAY

The Underpinning Ultimates

BY PROFESSOR A. M. HUNTER, PH.D., D.PHIL., D.D., THE UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

'The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.'—2 Co 13^{14}.

G. K. Chesterton once observed that if you ever found yourself renting a room from a landlady, your first question should not be about the food or the furniture she could offer you. No, it would be far better to fix her with a steady eye and demand, 'Madame, what is your total view of the universe?'

Absurd? Well, is it? Isn't everything else in the long run quite secondary? Isn't the really important thing just 'your total view of the universe'? *i.e.*, what you think about the ultimate realities which undergird your life? (It seems to me that the invention of the H-Bomb is forcing such questions on us with terrifying urgency; and it is my prayer that the fear of science may beget in men another fear—a fear that is wholesome and not horrible—the fear of the Lord which is the beginning of wisdom.)

If you had asked St. Paul what were the ultimate realities which underpinned his life, he would have answered, 'Why, the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit.'

Suppose we spend a little time thinking about them, for the words are so familiar that we seldom stop to think what they mean.

1. *The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ.* That is the first one. What is 'grace'? 'Grace' is the English equivalent of the Greek word *charis*. To begin with, *charis* meant 'that which gives pleasure.' When the old Greeks used it centuries before Christ, they liked to link it with loveliness, like that of the goddess Athene. Then came the gospel baptizing the word with new meaning, and henceforth grace became twin-sister to love. So, in the New Testament, 'grace' is just 'wonderful kindness,' the sort of kindness which takes your breath away when you realize how little you deserve it. And the grace of Christ?—it is simply His wonderful kindness to sinners—that kindness in action. As somebody has said, it is 'that quality in Christ by which He always comes to people when they need Him.' You remember how He came thus to humble folk in 'the days of his flesh'—to the disciples in the storm, to the woman that was a sinner, to Zaccheus of Jericho, to the Penitent Thief?

Well, Jesus, after He had risen, made a promise, 'Lo, I am with you always.' And ever since He has been coming to men and women like that: unseen, but not unknown. When Samuel Rutherford lay in his Aberdeen gaol, he testified, 'Jesus Christ came to me in my cell last night, and every stone glowed like a ruby.' It is the witness of the saints that Christ still comes like that. We all need His grace. We all may have it. That is the first reality undergirding your life as Christians.

2. The second is *the love of God.* Dwell a moment on the word 'love.' Nowadays it can cover almost 'everything from Hollywood to Heaven.' Alas, we have so soiled the word with ignoble use that it is no longer a wholly satisfactory equivalent of the Greek word Paul wrote. That word was *Agapē*; and if we want its New Testament meaning it is often better to use the

English word 'care.' Just try it out: 'God so *cared* for the world . . .' 'Thou shalt *care* for thy neighbour as thyself.'

Yet, to be frank, it is not the translation but the *truth* of the phrase which perplexes many of our contemporaries. They look out on the chaos and cruelty of the world to-day, and they say, 'Is it true? Does *God* really *care*?'

Well, the world contains comparatively few out-and-out atheists. Most people believe that the world did not just happen but that it was called into existence by some kind of Power or another. The question which vexes them is: What *kind* of Power? Is it good? Bad? Or just indifferent?

Now, like St. Paul, we Christians have no hesitation in answering. We believe that the Power behind the universe is not a Thing but a Person, not a Fate but a Father, a Father who cares.

Why do we believe this? We believe it because of the fact of Christ. Like St. Paul, we find the master-clue to the riddle of the world in Christ. We believe that the Supreme Being not only called the world into existence, and still keeps His controlling hand upon it, but that once in history He came right down into it as a Man, to show us what He is like, and then willed to die upon a Cross through and for our sins, that we might know how much He cares for us. So, when we are asked, How can you be *sure* of the love of God? we point to Christ: to Christ and His teaching first, for He taught us that God cares; but, above all, to Christ's Cross and the Empty Grave. 'He that hath seen me,' He said, 'hath seen the Father.' We see Christ dying upon His Cross, and we cry, '*God* cares—like that!' We see Christ risen from the dead in all His Easter glory, and we cry, 'Behold, the omnipotent love of the Father!' 'God! Thou art love! I build my faith on that,' says the poet; and so say we. 'The love of God'—why, it is the only thing that puts a meaning into this strange, riddling, bitter-sweet thing we call existence. The love—the caringness—of God shown in the deed of Calvary and in the shining miracle of the Resurrection—that is the second spiritual fact underpinning our lives as Christians.

3. And now this other one—*the communion, or fellowship, of the Holy Spirit.* There is an unsolved problem of interpretation here. The Greek word for 'fellowship' is *koinōnia*; but nobody knows for certain whether Paul meant 'the fellowship which the Holy Spirit creates' or 'fellowship in the Holy Spirit.' But does it matter greatly? Aren't both true?

Do you find the Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit hard to understand? Many people do. Then remember that it means quite simply, 'God here—here and now—and not simply in the Holy Land nineteen long centuries ago.' The Holy Spirit is the invisible power of God which, descending on God's people on the Day of Pentecost, has been working in them ever since. Not so much God above men, or God alongside them, as God inside them. Whether you know it or not, it is the power which prompts every true prayer you make; the power which helps you to confess Christ as your Saviour; the power which binds you, with other sinners, into that saved—and saving—community we call the Church; the power which inspires all true and lovely and heroic Christian living—

> And every virtue we possess,
> And every victory won,
> And every thought of holiness,
> Are His alone.

Shall we sum up? What are the three Divine realities undergirding the Christian's life? The answer is: the wonderful kindness of Christ, the infinite care of the Father, and the beneficent power of the Holy Spirit. Did I say three? Then I am wrong. For the three are one, the Trinity—Father, Son and Spirit, one God.

For nineteen centuries now millions of men and women have walked through the house of their pilgrimage and gone down at last to the Dark River, supported by faith in this triune God. Will you? Then go forth in that faith, and amid all life's ills and accidents, say with that gallant soldier of the Cross, Saint Patrick:

> I bind unto myself to-day
> The strong Name of the Trinity.

And may the wonderful kindness of Christ, and the infinite care of the Father, and the strong help of the Spirit be with you, now and always.

First Sunday after Trinity

The Confidence Which Wins

By the Reverend Arthur A. Cowan, D.D., Edinburgh

'And the Lord said unto Joshua, See, I have given into thine hand Jericho.'—Jos 6^2.

A young New Zealand beekeeper, named Edmund Hillary, said to his mother, 'Some day I will climb Mount Everest.' He dreamed about it, planned for it, decided it could be done, and then proceeded to achieve it. Mount Everest was the Jericho whose walls of snow and ice yielded to the climber who concluded they were not

impassable. Similarly, with Joshua, the capture of Jericho was an inward confidence before it was an outward event. It happened in his mind before it happened in the field. He discerned that there was a moral factor in history which was fighting for him and would carry him through to success. This convinced him that he could go forward without doubt or fear, and the victory was a spiritual assurance before it was an epic deed. 'And the Lord said unto Joshua, See, I have given into thine hand Jericho.'

It should be recognized that Jericho did not tumble down by sudden magic but by moral weakness. When we say that the opposition to some movement fell flat we mean that it was completely ineffective, and when the Bible relates that the walls of Jericho fell flat that is a metaphorical expression for a feeble defence. It is a mental picture of a city whose population had been so enervated by a hot climate that they were too lazy, sensual, superstitious, and corrupt to have much resistance power. How could these relaxed folk stand up to a war of nerves, an intimidating encirclement day after day which impressed them as uncanny and wore them down, till their morale collapsed at the final shock on the seventh day with the blast of trumpets and the war-cry of the desert clans? The fall of the city was the ultimate unfitness and abjectness of a long deterioration. But the victory of Israel was not a walk-over. There was a battle of sorts, as the twenty-fourth chapter makes clear: 'ye came to Jericho, and the men of Jericho fought against you.' Yet when Jericho was put to the test, it proved more vulnerable than its fortified appearance might indicate, and it was captured by a persevering faith, which kept up pressure on the obstacle to progress without losing heart. There was no defeatism, no grumbling that it was a long-drawn-out process, no complaint that people were sick of this foot-slogging against entrenched evil day in and day out. It is only a tenacious purpose and an enduring faith that bring the seventh day, the 'crowded hour of glorious life' which fulfils the initial assurance. 'And the Lord said unto Joshua, See, I have given into thine hand Jericho.'

The walls of Jericho blocked the road to the Land of Promise and barred the way to a better future. They stopped any advance into a more worthwhile and satisfying life. It is sometimes concluded that the obstacle to progress is too deep-rooted in the nature of things to be overcome and there is no getting over Jericho. Thomas Hardy describes the night drive to Casterbridge when Tess was asked by her small brother if the stars overhead were worlds like ours, and she replied that they were, some of them splendid and sound and a few of them blighted, and we happened to be living on a blighted one. 'Is it like that, *really*, Tess?' asked the boy. 'How would it have been if we had pitched on a sound one?' To which Tess replied, 'Well, father wouldn't have coughed and creeped about as he does, and wouldn't have got too tipsy to go this journey; and mother wouldn't have been always washing, and never getting finished.' Thus any chance of betterment is said to be baffled by an ironical fate in a blighted world, and people cannot escape from their inferiority, cannot get out of the bit. A feckless Jericho is assessed as a stronghold which stifles hope, and one need not expect to be ever any farther forward. But Joshua had a clearer perspective, a truer view, and perceived that wicked hindrances to progress had no right to exist and were less formidable than they looked. He saw it was God's purpose to give men a better future and therefore the frustrating walls of Jericho must be destined to fall flat. They were too intolerable to be impregnable. It must be God's will that these citadels of depravity should no longer debar people from a higher life but should topple down. 'See, I have given into thine hand Jericho.'

Here is a rebuke to those who are liable to be depressed and daunted by the fortifications of sin. Too many are unmanned by the tall talk of evil, by its hectoring tone and boastful threats, and surmise ruefully that such bastions of falsehood and wrong can never be laid low.

> Our doubts are traitors,
> And make us lose the good we oft might win,
> By fearing to attempt.

Joshua was confident that moral forces would make their weight felt decisively and would vindicate his bid to remove a rotten obstruction to general improvement. He was sure that this degenerate obstacle had been put within his power to crush.

For long the Bastille cowed the wretched people of Paris with its black tyranny, for who could hope to defy and conquer such a powerful prison-fortress? Then one day the oppressed populace, goaded beyond endurance, swarmed out in what seemed an impossible attempt to overcome it. But, greatly to their surprise, they found the Bastille with only one day's rations left, garrisoned by only thirty troopers and eighty tottering veterans under an incompetent commander; and in four short hours the incredible had happened, the Bastille had fallen, the walls of Jericho, which shut out any prospect of betterment, had gone down. So victory over some public scandal or abuse may be nearer than we imagine, and we may have a more favourable opportunity to

conquer the fortified evil than we sometimes suppose. The circumstances which mock our prayers and challenge our aspirations and dare us to advance are not so insuperable as they appear. The Jericho which flouts our conscience and taunts our best endeavours as futile and excludes us from the Land of Promise which God offers can be vanquished by a persevering faith. 'And the Lord said unto Joshua, See, I have put into thine hand Jericho.'

What is the Jericho which halts us on the journey to fulfilment? Whether it be a sin or a sorrow, a bad habit or a bad misfortune, an unjust law or an unworthy tradition, the obstacle must not be made an excuse for standing still and feeling helpless. It is too bad to last, and it is God's will that it should not last. It is not nearly so strong as it pretends to be, and it will fall flat when besieged by an unflagging confidence in the God of saving mercy revealed in Jesus Christ. The writer to the Hebrews says, 'By faith the walls of Jericho fell down.' The decisive events happen in our mind, take place in our spirit, in our belief as to what should be done and can be done. 'This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.' The Lord Jesus spoke of faith as a dynamic energy which can remove mountains of difficulty and demolish the most massive discouragement. This is the confidence that wins. Barbara Ward, in her book, *Faith and Freedom*, emphasizes faith as the source of man's greatness in investigating and mastering existence, and writes this: 'The Greeks affirmed man's power to build a rational order, the Jews proclaimed him a co-worker with God in the coming reign of righteousness. Faith led to achievement. The audacious view of man and his destiny is sustained only by faith.' Quite so! And the walls of Jericho go down before the awareness that God has called us and empowered us to subjugate the fortified evils which intercept our crusade for a future that will be, not merely nearer the heart's desire, but nearer the Divine pattern. Those in quest of a civilization, a country, a character more akin to God's self-revelation in Jesus Christ are not engaged in an independent venture, but can depend on God as its author and ally, who provides that no Jericho can exclude them from the things He has prepared for those that love Him. Newbolt has expressed this confidence—

> Thou wilt not turn Thy face away
> From those who work Thy will,
> But send Thy strength on hearts that pray
> For strength to serve Thee still.

Devoted lives on the march for a more Christian way of life have the Divine reassurance: 'See, I have given into thine hand Jericho.' Is not that what the gospel promises?

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Overcoming by Obedience

BY THE REVEREND JAMES MUNN, M.A., GLASGOW

'Obedience unto righteousness.'—Ro 6^{16}.

Somerset Maugham makes one of his characters say, 'I am not prepared to be made a fool of. If life won't fulfil the demands I make on it, then I have no more use for it. It is a dull, stupid play, and it is only a waste of time to sit it out.' Like this man, most of us go out into life making high and serious demands on it. But then, no less insistently life makes its demands on us, and to fight these off, to deny their validity, is to invite a chronic dyspepsia of the soul. The smooth-flowing harmony of a complete personality can be achieved only on certain terms; and of these obedience is a major condition. Because of a universal instinct men must and do choose whom they will serve.

So even in their least religious moods men set up gods before whom they fall down and worship. They may deify Reason, Fate, Nature, or the State; but they can never manage to burst clean away into utter emancipation. Joseph Conrad has it—'Wherever he stands, at the beginning or the end of things, a man has to sacrifice his gods to his passions or his passions to his gods.' At some point in life the mind must settle this issue and must name to the will the governor who is authorized to give orders. For religious folk life reaches its best, glows with light and colour and warmth and triumph, only through obedience to God. Every interest which is legitimate, every ambition which is pure, must be served within the framework of loyalty to Him. For a Christian the choice has been made and 'the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.'

Some have attempted to substitute Nature for God; they worship Nature, they live according to Nature. But this is an irresponsible religion, for they recognize no obligation to their Creator and no duty to others. Abandoning the noblest instincts, they become enslaved to the lower side of their personality, and this Paul calls 'obeying the flesh.' In earlier days this sort of man lived in a darkness which knew not the light; now such a life is possible only if a man chooses to reject the light.

Some name Moral Law as their master rather than God; if they aim at goodness, if they do their duty and help others, what more can be

asked of them ? Well, no one toiled more laboriously at this than did Paul ; every law he memorized, every injunction he placarded before his will. But never was a man so unhappy and impotent. However frantically he might strain, at the end of the day he remained a frustrated soul. Freedom, joy, peace, conquest were but mocking dreams ; under his inner defeats and outer tensions even his tenacity and determination were broken armour.

To liberate men from this hopelessness, to offer them a new power, a new way of life, a new relation with God, was the life-work of Jesus. And so, no longer doomed to face the bondage of laws and rules, Paul, the Christian, shouts the incredibly good news to the Church in Rome, ' Ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness . . . that we are the children of God.' Knowing God through Christ as their Father and themselves through Christ as sons of God, they sped eagerly into life with a lilt in their heart and a spring in their step ; they lived by a new obedience, the spontaneous, ungrudged obedience of loving sons living in the fellowship of a loving Father.

Since life itself is an affair of decision and action, not only of feeling and thinking, if we are to reach the blessedness Christ offers we require to make up our mind and act. It is not enough to withdraw from the dusty struggle to a comfortable contemplation of the Divine. The cloistered man who merely meditates is so much up in the air that he no longer has contact with the earth. Nor is it enough to select for action good works which appeal to us. For Christian obedience is founded on the lordship of Christ, not on the lordship of our own ideas of good. Nor yet is it sufficient to devote ourselves to private interpretations and ventures in religion. In old Israel we read, ' In those days there was no king in Israel : every man did that which was right in his own eyes ' ; therefore they had no absolute standards, no supreme loyalty, for they accepted no master.

The only sound principle by which our duty can be illumined and our obedience guided is that cry of the early Church, ' Jesus Christ is Lord.' He alone is ' the fountain light of all our day . . . the master light of all our seeing.' When he was asked the secret of his radiant and successful life General Booth replied, ' Jesus has had all of me.' And we choose Him not so much for any actual benefits in time or in eternity as for the sheer wonder of what He did and was and for the glory of what He is and does. ' I choose Christ,' writes Nicodemus in *Midnight Hour* ; ' this I know to be the choice of death, the death of self ; and I choose that death, not so much that I long for eternal life, but because when I consider Christ I can no other.' And so too say I. For nowhere in all the bright pages of history and nowhere in all the broad fields of experience do I see a leader to compare with Jesus or a saviour to challenge the Lord Christ.

We make our demands on life, and, rightly enough, life makes its demands on us. In all these Jesus Christ has done two things for us who name Him Lord. He has saved us from the bitterness of despair ; and He has made us more than conquerors.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY

Encountering Angels

BY PROFESSOR EDGAR PRIMROSE DICKIE, M.C., D.D., THE UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS, CHAPLAIN TO HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN

' And Jacob went on his way, and the angels of God met him. And when Jacob saw them, he said, This is God's host.'—Gn $32^{1.2}$.

When sitting down to write this sermon I ran across a sensible saying of the modern Simeon Stylites concerning University sermons. ' The orator should remember that the people in the audience carry union membership cards in the human race. . . . Perhaps they come not to hear Spinoza refuted or Barth either applauded or confounded, but to worship.' Surely he is right, this modern Man of the Column. We have not only minds to exercise, but souls to be saved.

That is, indeed, what we most require in this weekly hour of worship—to have our souls confronted with the eternal God. It may happen at any time. Jacob went *on his way* and the angels of God met him.

Angels are out of fashion. Byron thought he had disposed of them—

> The angels all were singing out of tune,
> And hoarse with having little else to do,
> Excepting to wind up the sun and moon,
> Or curb a runaway young star or two.

But they are on the way back. Francis Thompson began it—

> The angels keep their ancient places ;—
> Turn but a stone and start a wing !
> 'Tis ye, 'tis your estrangèd faces,
> That miss the many-splendoured thing.

And to-day we have the noted theologian of the Reformed Church, Karl Barth, giving two hundred

pages in his *Church Dogmatics* to the subject of Angelology.

Jacob saw the angels in armies, and he cried, 'This is God's host.' He was crossing the frontier into his own country, and the way was blocked. To get through he would have to force a passage against the battalions of God. It is probable that Jacob had never seen an army, had never witnessed a battle. Apart from a few collisions of rival herdsmen over the ownership of certain wells, the period is remarkably peaceful. But it is very likely that Jacob, as a boy, had revelled in the stories of the wars of Abraham, had loved what were literally 'Tales of a Grandfather.' Farther down this same valley of the Jordan in which he was now travelling, Abraham had once fought a battle royal—four kings against five; and Jacob, recalling that story, saw the valley again full of armies—but this time they were armies of the Lord, and he shuddered at the thought of passing through their lines.

Jacob had laid up great store of possessions. A pleasant life of comfort stretched out before him. He was on the way back to his native land, a man of the world, travelled, experienced, successful. If he liked, he might snap his fingers at Esau now, for a poor stay-at-home, content with his hunting and the meagre livelihood to be gained by it. Like many who have achieved worldly success early in life, Jacob might have said to his soul, 'Take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry.' Had he done that, he would never have met the angels. That type of man never does; his only glimpse of the unseen world is the one vouchsafed to the man in the story of Jesus, who found that he had made money enough and to spare for all his needs, and was looking forward to a life of ease and luxury. He feels a touch on the shoulder and, looking round with a start, finds himself gazing into the eyes of God. In making his calculations he had forgotten God.

But Jacob was a big enough man to realize that, with all his ambitions in the world fulfilled, he might quite well have missed, nevertheless, the thing that most mattered. And so, all this journey through, he has been asking himself how his *soul* has fared in the long sojourn abroad.

For two reasons Jacob was peculiarly liable to meet with angels on the way, and this suggests the first of them.

1. The angels met him as he went on his way, because he went *humbly*. He could hardly do otherwise if he was honest in recalling his past record. But which of us is honest in that respect? It was an influential man who was coming back to his native country. Witness the bands of retainers who made up his caravans. But when you have gained every success in the world and among men, you have still to reckon with the world that is unseen. Jacob had the humility to recognize this, and to wonder within himself whether, after all, his soul had travelled forward or back. The angels whom he met were therefore *accusing* angels. Angels are not necessarily 'bright and fair,' though, even when they are dark and accusing, they are for a man's good.

If we put his vision into prose, it would be something like this—that his conscience rose up against him like an accuser, a hostile army with power to destroy. His conscience was like an angel with a flaming sword. And conscience ought always to be like that. If it is not, we should set about developing it till it speaks without any hesitation and in this dramatic fashion. As a rule, it is so easily quietened; put to sleep till the inconvenient moment is past and it can safely be roused again. The secret lies in giving it plenty of work to do (it thrives on hard work), allowing nothing to pass into our life until it has gone through that barrier.

2. Jacob met with the angels because he went on his way *expectantly*. In every chapter of his life-story there is a kind of hush of excitement, as if he knew that the angels were just round the corner. To be confident that great things are about to happen to you is one of the surest ways of making them happen. An Old Testament scholar once spoke of the prophets as 'terribly one-sided people.' Their single idea was—'God is going to act; God is surely coming; He is here, at your very door.' It is just such sentinel souls who make it possible for mankind to march on from one victory to another. Not all of Christ's followers are like that. Some are satisfied—a dangerous condition. They would be surprised if any big thing happened in the world; still more surprised if it happened in their own life. Some are looking, but they are looking back. For some reason yesterday belongs to God, but not to-morrow. Are we waiting for the vision of the wonderful thing that God is going to make of our life and, by and through it, of the world? What is our attitude to the great dreams of men, like that of the abolition of war, the coming of brotherhood, the vanishing of selfishness and the triumph of love? Do we live and work in eager expectation of these?

Jacob, like his nation, had this one thing needful, the spirit of expectancy. That spirit persisted up to New Testament times. Many among the Jewish people were looking forward year after year to the coming of the Messiah. A few were earnestly expecting that He would come in their own day. The result was that Jesus came to *them*. The old man Simeon was able to take

the child Jesus in his arms, and to know that his expectations were fulfilled. If we feel sometimes that Jesus has not come with power into our lives, that we are not making the headway against temptations which we ought to be making as followers of Him, that we have not the faith nor the courage which we know very well ought to be ours as His disciples, the reason may quite possibly lie here. Jesus can come to us in power only on condition that we are constantly expecting Him to come. 'Expect great things from God: attempt great things for God'—the two parts of the motto are closely interwoven. Carey, who made the words his own, never forgot the place of courageous effort. It was characteristic of him that when as a boy he fractured a leg climbing a tree and was confined to bed for weeks, the first thing he did when he was out again was to climb that same tree. He needed a dauntless courage for his missionary work—to attempt great things for God. But equally he never forgot the power of hope, and of confidence in the gracious promises of God. Expect great things from God. We have not come to the end of the purposes and possibilities which God has in store for us. Let us thank God and take courage.

'The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge.'

Entre Nous

Autobiography by Anthology

It is true to say that any man who produces an honest anthology compiles a revelation of himself. In the passages and poems which he has collected, and which have stuck in his memory, he reveals himself. A man always reveals himself in his pleasures, and that is just as true in the case of his literary pleasures as it is in the case of any other pleasures. Mr. Victor Gollancz has for the second time produced a new kind of anthology. *From Darkness to Light* (Gollancz; 15s. net) is sub-titled *A Confession of Faith in the Form of an Anthology*. Unlike most anthologies it is not primarily meant to be dipped into. It is intended and designed to be read from beginning to end as a consecutive whole. Not only is each section designed to follow the previous section, but each extract is designed to follow the previous extract. It is, in fact, as its compiler says, semi-autobiographical.

There can seldom have been an anthology with such catholicity of choice as this; and seldom an anthology which contained so little hackneyed material. Wherever one opens it, treasures spring to view. But certain notes sound in it all the way through.

All through it there is *the love of truth*. W. R. Inge wrote: 'It is the belief of the present writer that the unflinching eye and the open mind will bring us again to the feet of Christ.' Truth can only be possessed at first-hand, and therefore every man must have the courage to find his own truth. 'There is an age in life when . . . we must make a clean sweep of all admiration and respect got at second-hand, and deny everything — truth and untruth — everything which we have not of ourselves known for truth. Through education, and through everything that he sees and hears about him, a child absorbs so many lies and blind follies mixed with the essential verities of life, that the first duty of the adolescent who wishes to grow into a healthy man is to sacrifice everything,' wrote Romain Roland. 'The essence of man lies in this,' said Guiseppe Prezzolini, 'in his marvellous faculty for seeking truth, seeing it, loving it, and sacrificing himself to it.' 'Talk nonsense,' said Dostoievsky, 'but talk your own nonsense. . . . To go wrong in one's own way is better than to go right in some one else's.' Coleridge said: 'He who begins by loving Christianity better than truth, will proceed by loving his own sect or Church better than Christianity, and end in loving himself better than all.'

All through it there is *the ideal of man*. The compiler of this anthology never admits total badness. A. E. wrote:

> There was never sin of thine
> But within its heart did dwell
> A beauty that could whisper thee
> Of the high heaven from which it fell.

Thomas Vaughan had the startling thought that God 'made man (as it were) for his playfellow.' 'What is great in man,' said Nietzsche, 'is that he is a bridge and not a goal.' 'The central conception of Man in the Gospels,' said Maurice Nicoll, 'is that he is an unfinished creation capable of reaching a higher level by a definite evolution which must begin by his own effort.' Meister Eckhart said: 'Our Lord says to every living soul, "I became man for you. If you do not become God for me, you do me wrong."' 'Every man,' said Swedenborg, 'is born for heaven.'

All through it there is above all *the sense of the beyond*. It is significant that the author whose

name appears most often is Blake. 'God forbid,' said Blake, 'that truth should be confined to mathematical demonstration!' Blake wrote: '"What," it will be Question'd, "When the Sun rises, do you not see a round disk of fire somewhat like a Guinea?" O no, no, I see an Innumerable company of the heavenly Host, crying, "Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord God Almighty." I question not my Corporeal or Vegetative Eye any more than I would question a Window concerning a Sight. I look thro' it and not with it.' An Hasidic Tradition is quoted: 'The day before he died Rabbi Shneur Salomon asked his grandson, "Is the ceiling still there?" When the boy said nothing, the Rabbi continued in a voice quivering with joy, "I can see no ceiling or walls: I can only see the life of everything, and God creating everything and making everything live."' It would be no bad definition of eternal life to say that it is the life in which the ceiling and the walls are all removed.

There is a strong mystical element in this book, yet all through it there runs the challenge to *practical service*. Thomas Vaughan said: 'Have thy Heart in Heaven, and thy Hands on Earth: Ascend in Pietie, and Descend in Charity, for this is the Nature of Light, and the Way of the Children of it.' Emily Dickinson wrote with a sweet simplicity:

> If I can stop one heart from breaking,
> I shall not live in vain;
> If I can ease one life the aching,
> Or cool one pain,
> Or help one fainting robin
> Unto his nest again,
> I shall not live in vain.

Mr. Gollancz is like the wise scribe bringing out of his treasures things old and new. To possess this book is not to possess a volume but to own a library in miniature. We may read it through, but after we have done so, it will remain constantly beside us as a book of devotion, for that is what essentially it is. WILLIAM BARCLAY

Hugh Redwood

In *Six Mighty Men* (Hodder and Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net) the Rev. W. J. Smart has attained his aim. He tells us in the Preface what his aim is—'to catch the passion of the six men about whom I have written, and to locate, as far as possible, the secrets of their power and their message for to-day.' The six mighty men whom he has chosen to write about are George Muller, Dwight L. Moody, Hudson Taylor, Samuel Chadwick, Hugh Redwood and Billy Graham.

On Hugh Redwood Mr. Smart says: 'London's newspaper world was completely astounded when the information flashed down Fleet Street that Hugh Redwood—a hard-boiled journalist and Night Editor of the *News Chronicle*—had turned religious and joined the Salvation Army.' What had caused the change? He was trying to get some music on the radio when the voice of Canon W. H. Elliott came through. 'As he listened, an immense longing gripped him side by side with an immense self-revelation.'

As he tells in his own 'God in the Shadows,' he knew 'that a Hand was held out to him; that here, undreamed of, unexplained, was God. . . .

'He did not hesitate. He did not doubt: it was much too real for doubt. The service was over: he rose from his chair and went upstairs to his bedroom. There, at his bedside, with a child's trust, he took the Hand that was offered him and, devoid of faith as he was, prayed that faith might be given to him. He knew that his prayer was heard, for an extraordinary sense of lightness came to him; he felt a buoyancy, a gladness, a singing at the heart.'

But this happened twenty-five years after the public act of decision he had made on hearing an address by Mrs. Bramwell Booth. Why had he fallen away from this first experience when Christ had become a living reality to him? He gave three reasons himself why it happened. 'First, he was given far too much publicity as a convert; second, he was given no proper teaching as a convert on the all-important subject of prayer; third, no one attempted to show him as a convert how to relate holy living to daily work.'

Samuel Chadwick

'The inner meaning of prayer Chadwick found in communion, fellowship, co-operation, identification with God the Father and the Son by the Holy Spirit.

'Prayer is more than words, for it is mightiest when wordless. It is more than asking, for it reaches its highest glory when it adores and asks nothing.

'When a child entered his father's study and walked up to him at his desk, the father turned and asked, "What do you want, sonnie?" The little chap answered, "Nothing, daddy; I just came to be with you."'[1]

[1] W. J. Smart, *Six Mighty Men*, 88.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.